JOURNAL

OF THE

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

(New Series)

EDITED BY

Dr. V. S. SUKTHANKAR and Prof. SHAIKH ABDUL KADIR

M.A., PH.D. (Berlin) M.A., I.E.S.

VOLUME I

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY

LONDON AGENT :

ARTHUR PROBSTHAIN

41, GT. RUSSEL STREET, LONDON, W C. 1.

1925

The Times Press, Bombay.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

New Series Vol. I.

ARTICLES.

BRIEF NOTES.

REVIEWS.

OBITUARY NOTICE.

INDEX FOR Vol. I. 1925.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

TRANSLITERATION

OF THE

SANSKRIT

AND

ALLIED ALPHABETS

SANSKRIT AND ALLIED ALPHABETS

अ	*a*	औ	*au*	ठ	*ṭh*	भ	*bh*
आ	*ā*	क	*k*	ड	*ḍ*	म	*m*
इ	*i*	ख	*kh*	ढ	*ḍh*	य	*y*
ई	*ī*	ग	*g*	ण	*ṇ*	र	*r*
उ	*u*	घ	*gh*	त	*t*	ल	*l*
ऊ	*ū*	ङ	*ṅ*	थ	*th*	व	*v*
ऋ	*ṛ*	च	*c*	द	*d*	श	*ś*
ॠ	*ṝ*	छ	*ch*	ध	*dh*	ष	*ṣ*
ऌ	*ḷ*	ज	*j*	न	*n*	स	*s*
ए	*e*	झ	*jh*	प	*p*	ह	*h*
ऐ	*ai*	ञ	*ñ*	फ	*ph*	ळ	*ḻ*
ओ	*o*	ट	*ṭ*	ब	*b*		

ं (*Anusvāra*)	*ṁ*	× (*Jihvāmūlīya*)	*h*
ँ (*Anunāsika*)	*m̐*	≍ (*Upadhmānīya*)	*ḫ*
: (*Visarga*)	*h*	ऽ (*Avagraha*)	’

NAME AND DESIGNATIONS OF THE RULER MENTIONED IN THE ĀRA INSCRIPTION

By Sten Konow

Etnografisk Museum, Kristiania

(*Communicated by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar.*)

In my edition of the Āra inscription[1] I followed Professor Lüders in reading the titles and designations of the Kuṣāṇa ruler mentioned in ll. 1 and 2 as follows : *Maharajasa rajatirajasa devaputrasa kaïsarasa Vajheṣkaputrasa Kaniṣkasa.*

I still think that this reading is the correct one, but as it has been doubted by some excellent scholars, I should like to make some remarks, which will also have to touch on some questions of a more general character.

The three first designations constitute, as is well known, the imperial title used by the Kuṣāṇa ruler of the Taxila silver scroll, whom I identify with Kujūla Kadphises. Among the kings of the Kaniṣka group it is used by Kaniṣka in the Sue Vihār inscription and also in the Brāhmī inscription of the year 7,[2] where the title *ṣāhi* is added, and by Vāsiṣka, in his Brāhmī inscriptions, likewise with the addition *ṣāhi*. Huviṣka is styled *mahārāja rājātirāja*, without the addition *devaputra*, in the Brāhmī inscription of the year 40[3] and in the Wardak Vase inscription of the year 51, while *devaputra* is added in the Brāhmī inscription of the year 60.[4] Finally Vāsudeva is styled *mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra* in the Brāhmī inscription of the year 74,[5] and, with the addition *ṣāhi*, in the record of the year 84,[6] and, without *devaputra*, in the epigraph of the year 87.[7] In other inscriptions the imperial title *rājātirāja* is missing, so far as I can control the materials here in Śāntiniketan.

We cannot, of course, draw any certain conclusion from this state of things, the less so because the epigraphs are all private records and not issued from a government office. We would, however, be inclined to think that the imperial title was adopted by Kaniṣka and

[1] *Ep. Ind.* 14, 130 ff. [2] Lüders No. 21. [3] Lüders No. 149 *b*.
[4] Lüders No. 56. [5] Lüders No. 60. [6] Lüders No. 69 *a*.
[7] Lüders No. 72.

continued by Vāsiṣka and the ruler of the Āra inscription. In the winter before the latter was executed, it had, however, been assumed in Mathurā by Huviṣka as well, and he was later on able to assert his position as *rājātirāja* not only in Mathurā, in the year 60, but also in the West, in Wardak, in the year 51. The last of the great Kuṣāṇas, Vāsudeva, finally, seems to have been recognized as paramount ruler, at least between the years 74 and 87.

I shall have to return to this question later on.

It will be seen that some of these rulers use the title *ṣāhi* in addition to *mahārāja rājātirāja devaputra*. It has usually been recognized that this *ṣāhi* is the same title as that used by the Sakas of Sagakūla, as mentioned in the Kālakācāryakathānaka. And there seems to be a general agreement as to the fact that the Kuṣāṇas considered themselves and acted as the heirs and successors of the Sakas in India. Vima Kadphises' conquest of 'India' seems, in Chinese as in Indian sources,[8] to have been considered as a reconquest, and there is nothing extraordinary in the fact that Kaniṣka and his successors use the Saka title.

It is, on the other hand, evident that Kaniṣka's accession brought about a strengthening of the national feeling of the Kuṣāṇas themselves, since he and his successors employ the indigenous form *ṣau* instead of *ṣāhi* in their coin-legends.[9] That did not, however, prevent them from using the Saka form in the old empire of the Sakas, which does not seem to have comprised the ancient stronghold of the Kuṣāṇas in Badakshan.

In the Āra inscription *ṣāhi* is replaced by *kaïsara*. The first akṣara of this title is, it is true, damaged, but there does not seem to me to be any doubt about the reading.

Kaïsara cannot, as has always been recognized since Professor Lüders read the word in the inscription,[10] be anything else than the imperial Roman title *Caesar*, and it presupposes that the inscription was executed at a time when the Roman empire was known in India as a powerful state.

---

[8] cf. *SBAW*. 1916, 811 ff.; *Ep. Ind.* 14, 293 ff.; *Acta Orientalia*. 3, 68 f.

[9] The Greek legend has *ṣao* and not *ṣau*, but then Greek *o* is also used to denote *u* in such forms as Κοζουλο, *Kujula*.

[10] *SBAW*. 1912, 824 ff.; *Ind. Ant.* 1913, 132 ff.

The late Dr. Fleet maintained[11] that the use of the title shows that the inscription cannot be later than the emperor Hadrian. He says: "The name Caesar, as an appellation of the head of the Roman State, started with Julius Caesar, to whom it belonged by birth. It was assumed, on adoption, by his grand-nephew and successor Octavianus, better known as Augustus from the title which was given to him by the Roman senate and people in B.C. 27. It was transmitted by Augustus, together with his own title, to his successors. And undoubtedly it was a very leading designation, along with Augustus and Imperator, of all the Roman emperors down to a certain time, and was probably the particular appellation by which they were most generally known and spoken of in popular usage in the western parts of the empire, though we may doubt whether the same was the case in the eastern parts."

"But there is an important change in the time of Hadrian (A.D. 117-38). He dropped the name Caesar as a title of the emperor and gave to it the application, which it continued to bear after his time, namely, he transferred it to the second person in the state, the intended successor to the throne. And though he did not make a Caesar till A.D. 136, when he adopted and appointed L. Aelius Verus, his coins show that he abandoned the use of the title by himself in A.D. 125."

"Thus from A.D. 125 the name Caesar was no longer a title of the emperors, but had only a subordinate value."

Dr. Fleet's remarks would, if they could be maintained, be fatal to any attempt at fixing the beginning of the Kaniṣka era after A.D. 125, as I have tried to do.[12] To judge from letters which I have received from Indian friends, they seem to have made a strong impression, and my remarks about the matter[13] do not appear to have carried conviction. I said, on the authority of my friend Professor E. Ziebarth, that all Roman emperors, with the exception of Vitellius (15-69 A.D.), use the title Caesar, and that Hadrian's innovation did not consist in abolishing its use as a title of the emperor, but in restricting it to the emperor himself and his successor and co-regent.

---

[11] *JRAS.* 1913, 103 ff.

[12] *Acta Orientalia,* 3, 72 ff.

[13] *Ep. Ind.* 14, 141 ff.

As the matter is of some importance from the point of view of Indian chronology, I think we must not rest contented at quoting what European scholars have written and said about it. We must turn to the inscriptions themselves. I have, therefore, taken before me the well-known edition of selected Latin inscriptions by Hermann Dessau[14] and there found the following state of things.

The title Imperator Caesar is used throughout by the Roman emperors also after Hadrian. For HADRIAN (A.D. 117-138) cf. Nos. 309 (A.D. 118), 310 (A.D. 119), 9055, 9189 (A.D. 120),.... 316, 317, 5956, 6073 (A.D. 136), 319, 328, 5963 (A.D. 137), 8909 (A.D. 138); for ANTONINUS PIUS (A.D. 138-161) Nos. 332, 333 (A.D. 138), 322, 334, 335, 336 (A.D. 139),....2006 (A.D. 158); for MARCUS AURELIUS (A.D. 161-180) Nos. 5933 (A.D. 161), 2452, 6225 (A.D. 162),....2616 (A.D. 170), 373, 374 (A.D. 176); for COMMODUS (A.D. 180-192) Nos. 5338 (A.D. 181), 6808 (A.D. 182), ...399 (A.D. 187), and so forth. The state of things is exactly the same with the later emperors, SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS (A.D. 193-211), CARACALLA (A.D. 211-217), ELAGABALUS (A.D. 218-222), etc. It is not, however, necessary to quote further instances, because the period I have selected covers the latest possible date for the Āra inscription.

It is of even greater importance to examine the Greek inscriptions, especially those hailing from Asia, because Dr. Fleet doubted the use of the title *kaisar* in the East. The state of things can be conveniently ascertained from R. Cagnat's *Inscriptiones Gracae ad Res Romanas pertinentes auctoritate et impensis academiae inscriptionum et litterarum humaniorum*, Tome III, Paris 1906.

We find that HADRIAN is styled *καῖσαρ* in Nos. 1068 and 1130, both from Syria, and elsewhere *αὐτοκράτωρ καῖσαρ*; ANTONINUS PIUS *καῖσαρ* in Nos. 17, 35 (from Bithynia), 1060 (from Syria) and probably in No. 1214 (from Arabia), and elsewhere *αὐτοκράτωρ καῖσαρ*, *κύριος καῖσαρ*, etc.; MARCUS AURELIUS *καῖσαρ* in Nos. 349 (from Pamphylia), 1245, 1299 (from Arabia), and elsewhere *αὐτοκράτωρ καῖσαρ*, *σεβαστός*, *Αὐγοῦστος*, etc.; COMMODUS *καῖσαρ* in Nos. 1133 (from Syria), 1225, 1251, 1276, 1262

[14] *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, vol. 1-3, Berolini 1892-1916.

(from Arabia), and elsewhere *αὐτοκράτωρ καῖσαρ, αὐτοκράτωρ, κύριος αὐτοκράτωρ*, and so forth.

It will be seen that the title *Kaisar*, alone or with some addition, is used throughout, in Asia as well as in the West, and, moreover, that it is always retained in its original form, while the other imperial titles are commonly translated into Greek in the Greek inscriptions, imperator as *αὐτοκράτωρ*, Augustus as *σεβαστός*, etc. We can therefore say that it had become the real title, which could not be changed or rendered into another language. And this inference is strengthened by the history of the title, not only in Europe, but also in Arabic and Persian.

It is accordingly impossible to follow Dr. Fleet in drawing the conclusion that the introduction of the title into India would not be possible after Hadrian's "reform." We can only say that it cannot be earlier than Augustus, and it is impossible to fix any lower limit.

We would, however, be inclined to think that the most probable time for adopting the Roman title would be some period when the fame of the Roman colours was at its height in the countries bordering on the Kuṣāṇa empire. And such was the case in the latter half of the second century A.D., when the Roman armies were repeatedly victorious against the Parthians. After that date the Roman power began to dwindle in those parts of Asia, and, on the other hand, the headquarters of the rulers of India soon ceased to be situated in the North-West. There is, therefore, nothing extraordinary in the fact that the use of the title *kaïsara* was not imitated by later rulers. Its occurrence in the Āra inscription, on the other hand, is in complete accordance with the theory that 134 A.D. is the initial point of the Kaniṣka era, which I have tried to make probable.[15]

The next word in the inscription should, I think, be read *Vajheṣkaputrasa*, though the second and third akṣaras present some difficulties.

The second one is in my opinion certain. The *e* mātrā is distinct, and the prolongation of the left-hand bar is also intelligible

[15] *Acta Orientalia*, 3, 52 ff.

if we compare the pointed shape of the letter in l. 13 of the Māṇikiāla inscription, where we must read *Kartiyasa majha.*

Instead of *ṣka*, we would be inclined to read *ṣpa*, because the *ṣka* of *Kaniṣkasa* is different. In my edition of the Āra inscription I have given my reasons for reading *ṣka* and drawn attention to the fact that the compound *ṣpa* does not occur in any Kharoṣṭhī inscription.

It will perhaps be of use to examine how a *pa* is treated in similar compounds in the North-Western dialect.

Our best source for studying the features of that form of speech is the Kharoṣṭhī manuscript of the Dhammapada, and the results of an analysis of that text are generally supported by the inscriptions.

We find that *p* is, broadly speaking, treated as in other Prakrits: it remains unchanged as an initial but is changed to *v* between vowels. An intervocalic *v* is, further, often interchangeable with *m*. Thus we find *namo* (Skr. *nāvam*); *emameva* (*evameva*); *vadamado*, i.e. *vadamando* (*vratavantas*); *uṭhaṇamado*, i.e. *uṭṭhāṇamado* (*utthānavatas*); *sabhamu*, i.e. *saṁbhamu* (*saṁbhavas*); *bhamaṇai* (*bhāvanāya*); *sa-meva* (*sā vaiva*), and, on the other hand, *jiṇav-iva* (*jīrṇām iva*); *puṣav-iva*, (*puṣpam iva*). The writing *m* for *v* also occurs where the *v* is derived from an old *p*; thus *pramuṇi* (*prāpnuyāt*), *viñamaṇi* (*vijñāpanīm*); *aprahai muṇi* (*aprahāya punar*). It seems necessary to infer that the pronunciation was in reality a nasalized *v*.

Now it is of interest to see that *p* and *m* are also treated in a parallel way after sibilants. *sm* becomes *sv*, for which M. Senart writes *sm*. There cannot, however, be any doubt about the proper reading, for the same compound also occurs in *svaga*, i.e. *svagga*, (Skt. *svarga*), and I do not think that anybody would seriously maintain that one and the same sign should be transliterated now in one and now in another way according to the exigencies of the etymology. We thus find *svadi* (*smṛtis*); *asvi loki parasa yi* (*asmin loke parasmiṁś ca*), etc.

The form *parasa* seems to stand for *parassi*; cf. the Patika plate where we apparently have *imasi saṁgharame* (l. 5), and the Taxila gold-plate, where I read *hasasi* for *hasisa* and

hasase.[16] In addition to forms such as *sadaṇa* (*smṛtānām*); *tasa* (*tasmāt*); *yasa* (*yasmāt*), it shows that the *v* was very weakly sounded, as is also the case when *sv* represents an old *sv*; compare *svaga* (*svarga*), but *salavhu* (*svalābham*); *rasa* (*hrasva*); *saigada*, i.e. *saiṁgada* (*svayaṁkṛta*).

In *samhaṣadi*, i.e. *saṁmhaṣadi*, from *saṁmṛśati*, *mh* is, as shown by Professor Leumann in the Album Kern,[17] derived from an old *sm*. In the same way the locative termination *-smin* occurs as *mi* in many Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, and that the *m* was here aspirated must be inferred from the curious hook below in *viharami*, etc., in the Wardak inscription.

We here evidently have before us two different stages of development, or different dialects. It is possible that the compound *sm* had become *mh* but might also be retained as a Sanskritism, and this latter form then became *sv* and later *ss*, *sv* being retained in writing even after the actual pronunciation had been changed to *ss*. But the forms may also belong to different dialects.

Now it is of interest to note that we have the same double treatment in the case of old *sp*. We find *sv* in *svihao* (*spṛhayan*), and we find *ph* in *phaṣai* (*spṛśati*); *phuṣamu* (*spṛśāma*).

With regard to old *ṣp* we have only one instance in the manuscript, viz. *puṣaviva payeṣidi*, i.e. *puṣṣav iva ppayeṣidi*. We can infer from this passage that *ṣp* became *ṣṣ*, and the form *Poṣapuria* in l. 4 of the Āra inscription shows that such was actually the case in the North-Western dialect, for *Poṣapuri* is evidently derived from a name representing Sanskrit *Puṣpapura*, which became *Poṣapura* and was later on misunderstood as *Puruṣapura*, the modern Peshawar. It should be remembered that Puruṣapura is not a very likely name, while everybody who has seen the

[16] It should be remembered that the two plates published of this inscription are derived from the same source, a seal-wax impression, which is stated to be not quite reliable; cf. *JASB*. 1862, 180 footnote. I think that it should be read *Sirae bhagavato dhatu pre(prati)ṭhava[ya*]tiye matu hasisa (hasasi) pidu hasase(si) loo tasa siyati* [or *siya ti*] *yo ha dehajati*, "of Śira who establishes a relic of Bhagavat in the haṁsa of her mother, in the haṁsa of her father, in order that it may find room when a corporeal birth takes place".

[17] This work is not here accessible to me, and I can only quote from memory.

beautiful flower-gardens in Peshawar will agree that it can very well be called *Puṣpapura.*

The change of *ṣp* to *ṣṣ* probably passed through the intermediate stage *ṣv*. We may infer this from the treatment of *sp* as also from the common writing *śp* for old *śv*. We find *śp* in forms such as *viśpa* for *viśva ; viśpaśa* for *viśvāsam ; viśpaśi* for *viśvaset*; and we find it in *Piśpasria* on the Mathurā Lion Capital and in *Veśpaśi, Veśpaśia* in the Māṇikiāla inscription. I do not venture to give an explanation of the former name, but *Veśpaśi* seems to me to be the same word which occurs as *Viśvaśika* or *Viśvasika* in some Mathurā inscriptions.[18] I shall not here discuss the question whether *Veśpaśi* is a name or a title, in which case the Satrap's proper name would be *Khujacia.*[19]

If *Veśpaśi* is written for *Veśvaśi*, we would be inclined to infer that *śp* had the pronunciation *śv*, which would then in the natural course of development become *śś*. That such was actually the case seems to follow from the fact that *śv* becomes *śś* in *avalaśa va bhadraśu* (*abalāśvān iva bhadrāśvaḥ*), A³ 15.[20] Also in the ancient Iranian language of Khotan *śv* becomes *śś;* thus *aśśi* 'horse'.

I think that we are justified in inferring from this state of things that a form such as *Vajheṣpa* would be against the phonetical laws prevailing in the North-Western dialect. Now the name of Kaniṣka's father should not be explained in accordance with the tendencies of an Indian form of speech. It no doubt belongs to the language of the Kuṣāṇas, which seems to have been identical with the Iranian language of Chinese Turkistan. Now it is a remarkable fact that the compound *ṣp* does not occur in that tongue

---

18 Cf. R. D. Bandyopādhyāya, *J&PASB*. 5, 242 f.

19 We read in the Māṇikiāla inscription ll. 7 ff.: *saha taeṇa Veśpaśieṇa Khujacieṇa Buriteṇa ca viharakaravhaeṇa saṁveṇa ca parivareṇa*, which can very well mean : "together with a triad, the Viśvāsika Khujacia, the Vihārakarāpaka Burita and the whole parivāra". As in the Patika plate the Navakarmika has subsequently entered his own name as well.

20 The *va* after *avalaśa* shows that the form cannot be acc. sing., in which case we would have *ba*. A comparison of the Pali passage shows that the common original must have had a form which might be understood as acc. plur. and also as acc. sing., in other words, it was written in a form of speech where the acc. plur. of *a*-bases ended in *aṁ*.

either, while *ṣk* is of frequent occurrence; cf. *oṣku* 'always'; *parrūṣka* 'the kleśas', etc.

In consideration of such facts I feel convinced that *Vajheṣka* is the proper reading in the Āra inscription, the more so because it is easy to recognize in Vajheṣka a name which we know from Kuṣāṇa inscriptions, viz. *Vāsiṣka*. Dr. Fleet, it is true, maintained[21] that the two forms Vajheṣka and Vāsiṣka are not so similar that we are justified in considering both as different attempts at rendering one and the same foreign name. He says: "The name which is given unmistakably as Vāsiṣka in the Brāhmī inscription of the year 24 would be quite naturally presented as Vasiṣka in any Kharoṣṭhī record, and there is no good reason for suggesting that the *s* stands in the Brāhmī inscription for anything else."

But, as a matter of fact, there is. Dr. Fleet has himself[22] admitted that Vāsiṣka is identical with the Kuṣāṇa ruler whose name is given in the Rājataraṅgiṇī, I. 168 as *Juṣka*, and the *j* of this form shows that the *s* of Vāsiṣka represents a voiced *s*, just as is the case in the well-known *Kujūla*, where the Greek rendering κοζουλο shows how the word was pronounced. Also here we find that some difficulty was experienced in rendering the foreign sound in Indian letters, for in the Patika plate and the Mathurā Lion Capital inscription we find *Kusuluka* and *Kusulaa* written with an ordinary *s*, just as in the Brāhmī Vāsiṣka.

On the whole the rendering of the voiced *s* is rather inconsistent in ancient records. That *jh* was used for that purpose is, however, absolutely certain. I have already mentioned the form *majha* in the Māṇikiāla inscription, which presents the same softening of an intervocalic *s* as is often met with in the Kharoṣṭhī documents from Turkistan, where we find *dajha* for *dāsa*, *dhivajha* for *divasa*, etc. And we can see that it was not rarely thus employed in Kharoṣṭhī at a time which is not far removed from the date of the Āra record. Thus we find *Jhoïla* on the coins of Zoilos; *marjhaka* and *erjhaṇa* in the Gudufara inscription of the year 103, where the corresponding forms *malysaki* and *alysānai* in the Iranian language of Eastern Turkistan show that the actual sound was a voiced *s*.

---

21 *JRAS.* 1914, 99 ff.

22 *JRAS.* 1903, 329.

Also *y* was, as is well known, used for the same purpose. I need only remind the reader of its occurrence in the name *Aya*= Azes. In Central Asia *ys* was used instead, and this same *ys* is, as shown by Professor Lüders[23] used in inscriptions and coins of some of the Western Kṣatrapas. In face of this state of things it is of no use to examine whether *ys* or *ghs* would, theoretically, be the more likely way of marking the voiced *s*, as done by Mr. N. B. Divatia.[24] The clear testimony of the Turkistan texts shows which expedient was actually chosen, whether it is considered to be in agreement with phonetical laws or not.

In the present connection I shall not enter into a further discussion of the various ways of marking a voiced *s* in Indian script or of the chronological conclusions which can perhaps be drawn from the writing *ys* in Kṣatrapa records. It is certain that *jh* was used to denote the sound in question, and in my opinion there cannot be any doubt that Vajheṣka is the correct reading in the Āra inscription, and that it represents a *Vāzeṣka*. It is certainly an Iranian name, derived from *vāza*, which means about the same thing as Skt. *ojas* and gives an excellent etymology of the name.

The next word in the inscription is *Kaniṣkasa*, here written with a dental *n*, while some other Kharoṣṭhī records have the cerebal. The dental is found in the Sue Vihār plate, and in the Shāh-jī-kī Ḍherī inscription, while the Zeda and Māṇikiāla records have Kaṇiṣka, Kaṇeṣka respectively. We cannot, at present, decide which form is the original one. The usual Brāhmī and Sanskrit form, however, speaks in favour of the dental *n*, which may represent an old *n* but also an old *nd*, which compound became *nn* or *n* in the North-Western dialect and apparently also in the ancient Iranian tongue of Eastern Turkistan.[25]

There remains one important question in connection with these names and titles: "Who was the ruler mentioned in the inscription? Was it the famous Kaniṣka, or was it one of his descendants?" Professor Lüders was of opinion that the great Kaniṣka, whose latest certain date is Sam. 23, was succeeded by

---

[23] *SBAW.* 1912, 406 ff. [24] Above, vol. 26, pp. 159 ff.

[25] The name can accordingly be derived from the base occurring in *candra* or from some word corresponding to *Skanda* or *skandha*.

Vāsiṣka (dates between 24 and 28), after whose death the empire was divided, Kaniṣka, the son of Vāsiṣka, ruling in the North, while Huviṣka held sway in India proper. Later on Huviṣka also became master of the North. Dr. Fleet, on the other hand, maintained that Vajheṣka, or, as he read, Vajheṣpa, was different from Vāsiṣka, and that Kaniṣka of the Āra record should be placed after Vāsudeva, when there was, he thought, a revival of the line of Kaniṣka, represented by the Āra and Māṇikiāla records, which would accordingly have to be dated in an unknown era and not in that of Kaniṣka.

I do not think that Dr. Fleet's view can be maintained. The alphabet of the Āra and Zeda inscriptions are so similar that they cannot be separated by a long interval. And, besides, everybody will agree with me in hesitating to assume the existence of a new and thoroughly unknown Indian era.

Nor am I able to accept the view that the ruler of the Āra record is the great Kaniṣka. That would mean assigning an exceptionally great length to his reign, and we have no reason for doing so. And, besides, the facts drawn attention to above with regard to the use of the imperial title *rājātirāja* speak strongly against this theory. We would have to assume that the title was borne simultaneously by Kaniṣka and Vāsiṣka.

I am not, myself, able to offer more than a suggestion. I would, however, draw attention to the order in which the Kuṣāṇa rulers are mentioned in the Rājataraṅgiṇī, I. 168 ff., viz. Huṣka, Juṣka and Kaniṣka. It seems to me that here we may have an indication that Huṣka, i.e. Huviṣka, extended the dominion of Kaniṣka to Kashmir, probably as Kaniṣka's general and viceroy. Later on he acted as viceroy in India proper, while Kashmir came under the rule of Kaniṣka's successor as emperor, Juṣka, i.e. Vāsiṣka. He was then succeeded as emperor by his son Kaniṣka II, who is perhaps the ruler mentioned by Kalhaṇa, as maintained by Mr. Hemchandra Raychaudhuri.[26] It is of interest to note, in this connection, that Kaniṣka does not play a prominent rôle in Kalhaṇa's account, where more importance seems to be attached to Juska, who is said to have founded two towns.

---

[26] *Political History of Ancient India* (Calcutta, 1923), p. 255.

In such circumstances I do not think that the empire was divided after the demise of Kaniṣka I. Vāsiṣka's titles show that he was recognized as emperor at least in Mathurā, but probably over the whole country, and as such he seems to have been succeeded by his son Kaniṣka II, who resided in the North-West or perhaps outside of India, while Huviṣka ruled as Mahārāja in India proper. Kaniṣka II may have died about the date of the Āra inscription. Already before that event, however, in the year 40, Huviṣka had made himself independent, and he soon became the acknowledged ruler of the whole empire, so that the Wardak inscription from Khawat had to be dated in his reign.

This is not more than an attempt at arranging the chronology of the Kaniṣka dynasty, but I can see nothing which militates against it.

January, 1925.

SOME UNPUBLISHED COPPER-PLATES OF THE RULERS OF VALABHĪ

By D. B. Diskalkar
Watson Museum, Rajkot
(Communicated by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar.)

§ 1

Copper-plates in the Vala Museum

Recently when I visited Vaḻā (a small town which occupies the site of old Valabhī and is now the capital of a Gohel king, who claims descent from the Maitraka family that formerly ruled there), I found in the local museum the copper-plates described below. They were discovered in 1900, when excavations were undertaken by the State at the ruins to the north-west of the present town. Almost all the plates were exceedingly corroded and lamentably damaged. This, I think, is probably the reason why scholars who had visited Vaḻā before me did not pay any serious attention to them, though they have been lying there, open to inspection, for so many years. Shri Vakhatsimhaji, the Thakur Saheb of Vaḻā, very kindly allowed me to take them to Rajkot for the purpose of cleaning and deciphering them.

As most of the plates were broken into several fragments, my first task was to piece them together and make the plates as complete as possible. Valabhī plates have this peculiarity that they are mostly of a stereotyped form, and consequently from the clue of a few letters that are preserved others preceding and following them can be supplied without much difficulty. The most important items in a Valabhī grant are those which relate to the date, the details of the grantee and of the property granted. If the date is preserved, the grantor's name can generally be ascertained. Thus a grant consisting of both the first and second plates, though injured in some parts, is of the first importance. Next in importance is the second half of a grant, which usually gives the date and other significant details. The first half of a

grant sometimes gives even the name of the grantor; in that case it is of some importance. But the first plate of a grant breaking off in the middle of the description of any king of the family is of little historical value, unless and until its second half is found.

After a careful examination of the fragments at Vaḻā, I found that the whole collection consists of 20 plates, making 16 Valabhī grants. Eight of these plates make up four complete grants; four plates are the second halves of four grants; and the remaining eight plates are the first halves of eight grants.

The collection contains grants of the following rulers:—three grants of Dhruvasena I, two grants of Dharasena II, three grants of Śīlāditya I (alias Dharmāditya), one grant of Dhruvasena III, and two grants of Śīlāditya III. The remaining five incomplete grants, consisting as they do of the first halves only, cannot be assigned to the reigns of any particular kings. But this much can be said about these plates that they are the first halves of grants issued after Saṁ. 286. For in the grants issued before this date the full genealogy of the family is given. But in grants issued in that year and thereafter the name of Guhasena immediately follows that of Bhaṭārkka in the genealogy.

From this collection of 16 grants we get, unfortunately, not more than four Valabhī dates: 226, 286, 287 and 343. We have already found three[1] grants of Śīlāditya I (Dharmāditya) of the year 286, and our grant of that year makes the fourth grant. The remaining three dates are, however, quite new. The date 287 of Śīlāditya I (Dharmāditya), though new, does not add anything to our knowledge of the period of his rule, as the latest date known of his is 290.[2] But the date 343 of Śīlāditya III is important, since it is the earliest date hitherto discovered of the king.[3]

---

[1] See footnote 7 below. [2] See *Ind. Ant.* 9, 237.

[3] In *Ind. Ant.* 5, 207 is published a Valabhī grant, said to be of Śīlāditya III, the date being read as 342. But after careful examination I find that the date is 372 and that grant, therefore, belongs to Śīlāditya IV. Thus the next known date 350 (*Ep. Ind.* 4, 76) of Śīlāditya III became then the earliest. Mr. R. D. Banerji, I understand, has in hand for publication a grant of Śīlāditya III dated 347.

The remaining date 226 is of still greater importance. It is of Dhruvasena I. His latest date hitherto known is 221.[4] Our date, therefore, increases the period of his reign by five years. The next known date of a Valabhī ruler—Guhasena—is 240.[5]

Another point of some importance is this. If anyone has still any doubts as to whether Valabhī is to be identified with the present Vaḻā, this find of Valabhī plates will altogether remove them. Most of these plates record Buddhist grants made to monasteries built in and around Valabhī. When Valabhī was destroyed by the Arabs, the monasteries suffered the same fate; and the plates granted to them and preserved in them lay buried in their ruins, until they were brought to light a few years ago. It is but natural, therefore, that they should be found, in an extremely damaged condition, in the ruins near the present town of Vaḻā.[6]

The following readings of the 16 grants are only tentative attempts at decipherment. Owing to the difficulties in the way of piecing together fragments of corroded plates, it is not always possible to note all the paleographical or orthographical peculiarities of each plate. But quite a large number of well preserved plates—not less than seventy—have already been edited with full particulars of their peculiarities. Valabhī plates, moreover, though they cover a period of more than two centuries (from *ca.* 500 to 765 A.D.), and were issued by not less than 19 different kings, offer, very rarely, as already remarked, any noteworthy singularities.

---

[4] See *WZKM.* 7, 299.

[5] *Ind. Ant.* 7, 66.

[6] In this connection it is interesting to note that the plates which had been reported to have been so long discovered in Vaḻā also record grants to Buddhist monasteries expressly mentioned as built in and about Valabhī. The grants of Saṁ. 216 (*Ind. Ant.* 4, 104), 240 (ibid. 7, 66), 246 (ibid. 4, 174 and *Ep. Ind.* 13, 338), were made in favour of monasteries built by the Princess Ḍuddā, in Valabhī. In the grant of Saṁ. 286 (*Ind. Ant.* 14, 327) the beneficiary is probably the same Ḍuddā-vihāra. The grant of Saṁ. 269 (*Ind. Ant.* 6, 9) was bestowed on the Vihāra built by the Ācārya Bhadanta Sthiramati in Valabhī. From this we can infer that other plates referring to Valabhī, the find-places of which had not been noted by the editors, might also have been discovered in modern Vaḻā.

No. I.—Two plates making a complete grant of Dhruvasena I : [Gupta-]Saṃvat 226.

These two plates are broken into several pieces. Four pieces are preserved of the first plate, and six of the second. With the help of these a large portion of the grant can be read and the loss is found to be not very serious. Each plate measures 11″×6½″. The inscription is very much damaged ; so much so that it is not possible to make an estampage of it. The portions of the second plate containing the benedictory and imprecatory verses and the date are sufficiently clear.

The grant, issued from Valabhī, records a gift by Dhruvasena I to a Brahman residing in Ānarttapura. The details of the grantee and the property granted are lost, but the property seems to consist of some pādāvarttas of land in the Sopokendraka-maṇḍalī (?).

There are three characteristics of the grant that require to be noted. We find for Dhruvasena in this grant one more epithet, which is not found in other grants of the king, nor in the other grants mentioning his name. It is mentioned in lines 10 and 11 of the first plate.

Another point is that the date of this grant is given both in words and in numerical symbols, so that no doubt need be entertained about the latter.

The date and the name of the writer are given in a verse. The writer's name is altogether a new one. The name of the Dūtaka is not mentioned.

The date, 226, of the grant is new and is of very great importance for our knowledge of the Valabhī period. For the latest date of the king Dhruvasena I hitherto known was 221 (*WZKM.* 7, 299) and our grant therefore increases the period of his reign by not less than five years. The next date found of a Valabhī ruler—Guhasena—is 240 (*Ind. Ant.* 7, 66). It is not known whether the intervening ruler, Dharapaṭṭa, issued any grants at all.

TEXT.[1]

First plate.

1 [ओं स्वस्ति **वल**]**भीत**: प्रसभप्रणता[मित्राणां मै]त्रकाणामतुलबल-
सपत्नमण्डलाभोगसं[सक्तसंप्रहार-]

2 [शतलब्धप्रता]प: प्रतापोपनत[दानमाना]र्ज्जवोपार्ज्जितानुरागानुरक्त-
मौलभृतमित्रश्रे[णीबलावाप्त-]

3 [राज्यश्री: परम]माहेश्वरश्रीसेनापति**भटा**[**र्क्कस्त**]स्य सुतस्तत्पादर-
जोरुणावनतपवित्रीकृताशिराश्शि[रोवनत-]

4 शत्रुचूडामणिप्रभाविच्छुरितपादनखपङ्क्तिदीधिति: दीनानाथजनोपजीव्य-
मानविभव: प[रमभा-]

5 हेश्वर: सेनापति**धरसेन**स्तस्यानुजस्तत्पादाभिप्रणामप्रशस्ततराविमलमौलि-
मणिर्म्मन्वादिप्रणीत-

6 विधिविधानधर्म्मा धर्म्मराज इव विहितविनयव्यवस्थापद्धतिरखिलभुवन-
मण्डलाभोगैकस्वामिना

7 परमस्वामिना स्वयमुपहितराज्याभिषेक[2] महाविश्राणनावपूतराज्यश्री:
परममा-

8 हेश्वर: श्रीमहाराज**द्रोणसिंह**: सिंह इव तस्यानुज: स्वभुजबलपरा-
क्रमेण परगजघटानीकाना-

9 मे[क]विजयी शरणैषिणां शरणमवबोद्धा शास्त्रार्थतत्वानां कल्पतरुरिव
सुहृत्प्रणयिनां यथाभिलषि-

10 [तका]मफलोपभोगद: [3]स-धिकसमाशत . . . .

11 . . . . . शिरप्रणामप्रशस्ततरीकृतविमलपादकमलयुगल: परमभट्टा-
रकपादानुध्या-

12 [तमहासामन्तमहाराज]**ध्रुवसेन**: कुशली सर्व्वानेव स्वानन्यांश्चायुक्त-
कविनियुक्तकानन्यांश्च यथा-

13 [संबध्यमानकाननुदर्श]यति यथा **मयानर्त्तपुर**वास्तव्य . .
. . . प-ग्राम

14 षाय स हर . . पल्लीक

[1] The texts of all inscriptions edited in this article are given from the original plates.—[2] Read °षेको.—[3] This epithet is not found in any other grant.

Second plate.

15 . . . .
शतमेकं मातापित्रो: [पुण्याप्यायना-]

16 र्त्थमात्मनश्च पुण्ययशोभिवृद्धये . . . .
क्रियोत्सर्प्पणार्त्थमाचन्द्रार्क्क[4]अर्ण्णवक्षिति-

17 समकालीनं पुत्रपौत्रान्वयभो[ग्यं सो]द्र[ङ्गं सो]परिकरं सभूतवात-
. प्रत्यायं सर्व्वहिरण्या-

18 . . . . . . कीयानामहस्तप्रक्षेपणीयं भूमि . . . . . .
सोपोकेन्द्रकमण्डल्यां ब्रह्मदेयः निसृष्टः

19 . . . . ब्रह्मदेयास्थित्या भुंजतः[कृषतः कर्ष]यतः प्रदिशतो
वा न कैश्चिद्व्यासेध[5] परिपन्थना वा

20 . . . . शजैरागामिनृपतिभिश्चानित्यान्यैश्व[र्य्या]ण्यास्थिरं मानुष्यं
सामान्यं च भूमिदानफलमिति

·21 . . . . स्मद्दायोनुमन्तव्यः पालयितव्यश्च य[श्चैनं] छिद्यादा-
च्छिद्यमानं वानुमोदेत स पञ्चमहा-

22 [पा]तकैस्संयुक्तस्स्यादपि चात्र व्यासे[न गीताः श्लो]का भवन्ति[।*]
षष्टिं वर्षसहस्राणि स्वर्गे मोदति

23 [भूमिदः आच्छेत्ता चानुमन्ता च ता]न्येव नरके [वसेत् स्वद]त्तां
परदत्तां वा यो हरेत वसुन्धरां स विष्टा

·24 . . . . यत्नाद्रक्ष युधिष्ठिर महीं महिमतां श्रेष्ठ

25 . . . . स्वहस्तः श्रीध्रुवसेनस्य[।*] त्रिपु[6](?)क

26 . . . . शुक्लपक्षस्य पुण्यायां पौर्ण्णिमा[तिथौ][6]

27 . . . . भद्रेण लिखितं ताम्रशासनं [।*]

28 . . . . स २०० २० ६ कार्त्तिक शु १० ५

[4] Read ०चन्द्रार्क्कार्ण्णव०—[5] Read ०द्व्यासेधः. In some other plates these terms are replaced by स्वल्पाप्याबाधा विचारणा वा.—[6] These expressions expressive of the date of the grant are to be found only here.

No. II.—First plate of a grant of Dhruvasena I.

This is a piece of the first plate of a Valabhī grant. It fortunately preserves enough to show that the grant is of Dhruvasena I.

The measurements of the plate cannot be given. It has a small hole on the right hand side, having in it a very small and thin copper ring, unlike those usually found on Valabhī plates.

The letters are very clearly and carefully engraved and what remains of the inscription on the plate can be easily read.

TEXT.

1 . . . .

2 . . . .

3 [[1]राज्यश्रीः परममाहेश्वरः सेनापतिश्रीभटक्कस्तस्य सुतस्त]त्पादर-
[जोरुणावनतप]वित्री-

4 [कृतशिराः शिरोवनतशत्रुचूडामणिप्रभाविच्छुरितपादनखप]ङ्क्तिदी-
धितिर्द्दीनानाथजनोपजी-

5 [व्यमानविभवः परममाहेश्वरस्सेनापतिधरसेनः तस्यानुजस्तत्पादा-]
भिप्रणामप्रशस्तविम-

6 [लमौलिमणिर्म्मन्वादिप्रणीतविधिविधानधर्म्मा धर्म्मराज इव विहित-]
विनयव्यवस्थापद्धतिरखि-

7 [लभुवनमण्डलाभोगस्वामिना परमस्वामिना स्वयमुपहित]राज्याभिषेको
महाविश्राण-

8 [नावपूतराज्यश्रीः परममाहेश्वरो महाराजश्रीद्रोणसिंहस्सिंह इव
तस्यानुजः स्व]भुजबले-

9 [न परगजघटानीकानामेकविजयी शरणैषिणां शरणमवबोद्धा शास्त्रा-]
र्थतत्त्वानां कल्पतरुरिव

10 [सुहृत्प्रणयिनां यथाभिलषितफलोपभोगदः परमभागवतः पर]मभट्टार-
कपादानुध्यातो

11 [[2]महाराजध्रुवसेनः कुशली सर्व्वानेव स्वानायुक्तकविनियुक्तक-]
महत्तरचाटभटदाण्डपाशि-

12 [कध्रुवाधिकरणिकादीनन्यांश्च यथासंबध्यमानकाननुदर्शय]त्यस्तु वस्सं-
विदितं यथा मया

13 [3]. . . . .

[1] The words in brackets have been put in by calculation.—[2] If my calculation of the missing letters is correct we have no space for the epithet महासामन्त of Dhruvasena which we find in some of his grants.—[3] The portion of the plate containing the last line has peeled off. But there are traces of illegible letters.

No. III.—First plate of a grant of Dhruvasena I.

This plate has suffered a little on all its sides. The measurements of the plate are 11″×6¼″.

The letters, though not in perfect straight lines, are very clearly and separately engraved. The engraver has sometimes omitted, through inadvertence, one or more letters in the middle of a word.

The grant, though it does not expressly give the name of the donor, is undoubtedly one of Dhruvasena I, as may be seen from the last two lines. From the wording of the plate it seems that it is one of the earlier grants of the king.

Text.

1 . . . . त्नमण्डलाभोगसंयुक्तसं-

2 [प्रहारशतलब्धप्रतापः प्रतापो]पनतदानमानार्ज्जवोपार्ज्जितानुरागोनु-
रक्तमौ-

3 [लभृतश्रेणीबलावाप्तरा]ज्यश्रीः परममाहेश्वरः श्रीसेनापति**भटार्क**स्त-

4 [स्य सुतस्तत्पाद]रजोरुणा[व*]नतपवित्रीकृतशिराः शिरोवनतशत्रुचूडामणि-
[प्रभाविच्छु-]

5 [रि]तपाद[न]खपङ्क्तिदीधितिर्द्दीनानाथ[1]जनोपजीव्यमानविभवः परममा-

6 [हेश्वरः से]नापति**धरसेन**स्तस्यानुजस्तत्पादाभि[2]प्रशस्तविमलमौलि-
[माणि-]

7 [र्म्मन्वादि]प्रणीतविधिविधानधर्म्मा धर्म्मराज इव विहितविनय-
व्यवस्थाप[द्धतिराखिल-]

8 भुवनमण्डलाभोगै[क*]स्वामिना परमस्वामिना स्वयमुपहितराज्या-
भिषेकमहावि-

9 श्रा[ण]नावपूतराजश्रीः[3] परममाहेश्वरो[4] महाराज**द्रोणसिंह**[:*] सिङ्ह[5]
इ[व तस्यानु-]

[1] The word कृपण is not given here after दीनानाथ as we find it in some other plates.—[2] The word प्रणाम is not given here after पादाभि as we find it in some other plates. The wording has similarity with the plates of 207 rather than with later plates, for instance, of 221. It seems that the present grant is one of the earlier ones.—[3] Read °राज्य.° —[4] Here also the construction is more like that in the grant of 207.—[5] Read सिंह.

10 जस्स्वभुजबलेन[6] परगजघटानीकानामेकविजयी शरणै[षिणां शरणमव-]

11 [बोद्धा शास्त्रार्थतत्त्वा]नां कल्पतरुरिव सुहृत्प्रणयिनां यथाभि-
[लषितकामफलोपभो-]

12 [गद: परमभागवत: प]रमभट्टारकपादानुद्ध्याती म[हाराज-
श्रीध्रुवसेन:]

13 [[7]कुशली सर्व्वानेव स्वानायुक्तक]विनियुक्तक[द्राङ्गिकमहत्तरचाटभट]

[6] In some other plates the wording is स्वभुजबलपराक्रमेण.—[7] The letters in brackets are put in by calculation only.

No. IV.—Two plates making a complete grant of Dharasena II.

These two plates, of which the surface is pierced by a number of small holes, are very thin and are consequently very fragile. The right hand portion of each plate has crumbled away.

The plates measure about 12″×8¼″ each, and there are 17 lines of writing on each plate.

The portion of the first plate containing the name of the place from where the grant was issued is illegible.

Though the name of the grantor king is lost in the broken portion, the grant was no doubt issued by Dharasena II, as is clear from lines 21 and 22. The beneficiary was some Buddhist monastery in Valabhī.

The details of the property granted to the monastery are lost to us, but it seems to have been situated in the village Hariyāṇaka.

The purpose for which the grant was issued is, as usual with Buddhist grants, to provide for the worship of the Buddhas, for the lodging, boarding, etc., of the inmates of the monastery, and for its repairs.

The following are some of the officers to whom the grant was addressed by the king : Āyuktaka, Viniyuktaka, Mahattara, Cāṭa, Bhaṭa, and Dhruvādhikaraṇika.

The Dūtaka, or the executive officer of the present grant, was Śīlāditya. The name of the writer is lost, but from his epithets it seems that he was the same Divirapati Skandabhaṭa, whom we find writing most of the grants of Dharasena II.

Unfortunately the portion of the plate containing the date is lost, but we can say that the grant belongs to the latter part of the king's rule. For, though the writer is the same, the Dūtaka is Cirbbiṛa in all the grants of Saṁ. 252 ; while in the grants of 269 and 270 the Dūtaka is Śīlāditya, as in the present grant. Secondly, in the earlier grants of Dharasena II he rarely bears the epithet Sāmanta.

In the later grants, however, he invariably bears the epithet Mahāsāmanta. In the present grant no epithet is found used. It is just possible, therefore, that the present grant is later than Saṁ. 252 but earlier than Saṁ. 269.

TEXT.

1 . . . . शतलब्धप्र-

2 . . . . लभृतमित्रश्रेणी . . .

3 श्रीः [परममाहेश्वरः श्रीसेनापति**भटार्कः**] . . . .
वित्रीकृ . . .

4 . . . . [श्रीसेनापति**धरसेन**स्तस्या-]

5 [नुजस्तत्पाद]प्रणामप्रशस्ततरविमलमौलिमणिर्म्मन्वादिप्रणीतविधि[विधा-
नधर्म्मा धर्म्मराज इव]

6 विहित[विनयव्यवस्था]पद्धतिरखिलभुवनमण्डलाभोगैकस्वामिना परम-
स्वामिना स्वयमुप[हितराज्याभिषेको महा-]

7 विश्राणनावपूतराज्यश्रीः परममाहेश्वरो महाराजश्री[**द्रोणसिंहः**]
सि[ङ्ह इव तस्या]नु . . . . .

8 नपरगजघटानीकानामेकविजयी शरणैषिणां शरणमवबोद्धा शास्त्रार्थ-
तत्वानां क . . . .

9 नां यथाभिलषितकामफलोपभोगदः परमभागवतः श्रीमहाराज**ध्रुवसेन**-
स्तस्यानु[जस्तच्चरणारविन्द-]

10 प्रणतिप्रविधौताशेषकल्मषः सुविशुद्धस्व[च*]रितोदकक्षालिताशेषकलिकल-
[ङ्कः : प्रसभनिर्ज्जितारातिपक्षप्रथित-]

11 महिमा परमा[दित्यभक्तः श्री]महाराज**धर**[पट्टस्तस्य सु]तः
तत्पादसपर्य्यावाप्त . . . . .

12 भृति खड्गद्वितीयबाहुरेव समदपरगजघटास्फोटनप्रकाशितसत्वनिकष:
तत्प्रभा . . . .

13 रत्नप्रभासंसक्तसव्यपादनखरश्मिसंहति[1] सकलस्मृतिप्रणीतमार्ग्गसम्यक्परि-
पालनप्रजा[हृदयरञ्जना-]

14 दन्वर्त्थ[राजशब्दः रू]पकान्तिस्थैर्य्यधैर्य्यगाम्भीर्य्यबुद्धिसंपद्भिः स्मरशशा-
ङ्काद्रिराजोदधित्रिदशगुरुधनेशान-

15 तिशयान[: शरणा]गताभयप्रदानपरतया तृणवदपास्ताशेषस्वकार्य्यफल-
प्रार्त्थनाधिकार्त्थप्रदानानन्दित-

16 [विद्वत्सुहृ]त्प्रणयिहृदयः पादचारीव सकलभुवनमण्डलाभोगप्रमोदः
परममाहेश्व[रः महाराज-]

17 [**श्रीगुहसेनः**] तस्य सुतस्तत्पादनखमयूखसन्तानविसृतजाह्नवी-
जलौघविक्षालिताशेषकल्मषः

Second plate.

18 [प्रणयिशतसह]स्रोप] जीव्यमानभोग]संपद्रूपलोभादिवाश्रि[तः सरभसमाभि]
गामि[कैर्गुणैः]

19 [सहज]शक्तिशिक्षाविशेषविस्मापिताखिलधनुर्द्धरः प्रथमनरपतिसमति-
सृष्टाना[मनुपालयिता धर्म्म-]

20 [दायाना]मपाकर्त्ता प्रजोपघातकारिणामुपप्लवानां दर्शयिता श्रीसरस्वत्यो-
रेकाधिवा . . . . .

21 [लक्ष्मी]परिभोगदक्षविक्रमक्रमोपसंप्राप्तविमलपार्थिव[2]श्री परममाहेश्वरो
महारा[जश्री**धरसेनः** कुशली]

22 [सर्व्वानेवा]युक्तकविनियुक्तकमहत्तरचाटभटध्रुवाधिकरणिक . . .

23 . . . . . . यथासंबध्यमानकान्समाज्ञापयत्यस्तुवस्संविदितं
यथा मया . . . .

24 [नश्चैहिका]मुष्मिकयथाभिलषितफलावाप्तये श्री**वलभी** . . . .

25 . . . . बुद्धस्य बुद्धस्य पुष्पधूपदीपतैलपूजानिमित्तं चतुर्द्दिगभ्या-
गतभिक्षुसंघस्य

26 . र्त्थं विहारस्य च खण्डस्फटितविशीर्ण्णप्रतिसंस्करणार्थं . .

27 . . . **हरियाणक**ग्रामे पूर्व्वदक्षिणदि . . . .

28 सभूतवातप्रत्यायः सधान्यगतभागः सहिर . . . स्य . .

[1] Read संहतिः.—[2] Read श्रीः.

29 प्रक्षेपणीय: भूमिच्छिद्रन्यायेनाचन्द्रार्क्कार्ण्णवसरित्क्षिति . . . . .

30 . . . परिपन्थना कार्य्यागामिभद्रनृपतिभिरस्मद्[3]इ्शजैर्व्वा .

31 दानफलमवगच्छद्भिरयमस्मद्दायोनुमन्तव्य . . . . . .

32 धर्म्मायतनीकृतानि निर्म्माल्यमाल्य . . . .

33 . . . .

34 दूतक: [श्री]शीलादित्य: लिखितं सन्धिविग्रहाधिकृत[दिविरपति-
स्कन्दभटेन] स्व . .

[3] Read वंशजैर्व्वा.

No. V.—First plate of a grant of Dharasena II.

This plate is broken at its two lower corners, but is otherwise in a tolerably good condition. It measures 9″×12″ and contains 19 lines of writing, which is almost free from grammatical mistakes. The grant was issued from Valabhī.

The plate ends with the introductory descriptive portion of Dharasena II. But the grant is no doubt of the same king. For, the introductory portion of the grant contains the complete genealogy of the dynasty from the founder Bhaṭārkka without any curtailment as is found in the grants issued since the time of Śīlāditya I, who was the immediate successor of Dharasena II. In all grants later than those of Dharasena II, the name of Guhasena immediately follows that of Bhaṭārkka in the genealogy of the family, the names of the four intervening rulers Dharasena I, Droṇasiṁha, Dhruvasena I, and Dharapaḍa (or Dharapaṭṭa) being altogether dropped. This grant, therefore, which gives in the first plate the descriptive portion of Dharasena II (though not his name) must have been issued by Dharasena II himself, and if by chance the second plate is found we shall surely find it so. Further the grant can be shown to belong to the earlier period of the reign of Dharasena II. For the earlier grants, that are found of the king, e.g. of Saṁ. 248 and 252 are issued from Valabhī and the later grants, e.g. of Saṁ. 269 and 270 are issued from a military camp, Bhadrapaṭṭana. The present grant was issued from Valabhī. Hence it is very likely that it belongs to the earlier period of his reign.

TEXT.

1 ओं स्वस्ति **वलभीतः** प्रसभप्रणतामित्राणां मैत्रकाणामतुलबलसपत्नमण्ड-
लाभोगसंसक्तसंप्रहारशतलब्ध-

2 प्रताप: प्रतापोपनतदानमानार्ज्जवोपार्ज्जितानुरागादनुरक्तमौलभृतश्रेणीबला-
वाप्तराज्यश्रीः

3 परममाहेश्वरः श्रीसेनापति**भटार्क्क**स्तस्य सुतस्तत्पादरजोरुणावनतपवित्री-
कृतशिराः शिरोवनत-

4 शत्रुचूडामणिप्रभाविच्छुरितपादनखपंक्तिदि[1]धितिर्द्दिनानाथकृपणजनोपजीव्य-
मानविभवः परममाहेश्वरः

5 श्रीसेनापति**धरसेन**स्तस्यानुजस्तत्पादाभिप्रणामप्रशस्ततरविमलमौलिम्माणि-
र्म्मन्वादिप्रणीतविधिविधानधर्म्माधर्म्म-

6 राज इव विहितविनयव्यवस्थापद्धतिरखिलभुवनमण्डलाभोगैकस्वामिना
परमस्वामिना स्वयमुपहित-

7 राज्याभिषेकः महाविश्राणनावपूतराजश्रीः परममाहेश्वरः श्रीमहाराज-
द्रोणसिंह: सिंह इव तस्यानु-

8 जः स्वभुजबलपराक्रमेण परगजघटानीकानामेकविजयी शरणैषिणां शरणमव-
बोद्धा शास्त्रार्थ-

9 [त]त्वानां कल्पतरुरिव सुहृत्प्रणयिनां यथाभिलषितफलोपभोगदः परम-
भागवतः श्रीमहाराज-

10 [**ध्रुवसेन**स्तस्या]नुजस्तच्चरणारविन्दप्रणतिप्रविधौताशेषकल्मषः सविशुद्ध-
स्वचरितोदकक्षालिताशेष-

11 [कलिकलङ्क]: प्रसभनिर्जितारातिपक्षप्रथितमहिमा परमादित्यभक्तः
श्रीमहाराज**धरपट्ट**स्तस्य

12 [सुतस्तत्पादसपर्य्यावाप्तपु]ण्योदयः शैशवात्प्रभृतिखड्गद्वितीयबाहुरेव समद-
परगजघटास्फोटनप्रकाशित-

13 [सत्वनिकषस्तत्प्रभावप्रणतारा]तिचूडारत्नप्रभासंसक्तसव्यपादनखरश्मिसंह-
तिस्सकलस्मृतिप्रणीतमार्ग्गसम्यक्परि-

14 [पालनप्रजाहृदयरंजनादन्वर्थरा]जशब्दो रूपकान्तिस्थैर्य्यगाम्भीर्य्यबुद्धिसंप-
द्भिः स्मरशशाङ्काद्रिराजोदधित्रिदश[गुरुध-]

15 [नेशानतिशयानः शरणागताभ]यप्रदानपरतया तृणवदपास्ताशेषस्वकार्य्य-
फलः प्रार्थनाधिका[र्थप्रदानान-]

16 [न्दितविद्वत्सुहृत्प्रणयिहृदय:] पादचारीव सकलभुवनमण्डलाभोगप्रमोद: परममाहेश्वरो [महाराजश्री-]

17 [**गुहसेन**स्तस्य सुतस्तत्पाद]नखमयूखसंताननिर्व्वृत्तजाह्नवीजलौघविक्षालि- ताशेष[कल्मष: प्रण-]

18 [यिशतसहस्रोपजीव्यमान]भोगसंपत् रूपलोभादिवाश्रितस्सरसमाभिगामि- [कैर्ग्गुणैस्सहज-]

19 [शक्तिशिक्षाविशेषावि]स्मापिताखिलधनुर्द्धर: प्रथमनरपतिसम[तिसृष्टानामनु]

[1] Read दीधितिर्दीना°

No. VI.—Second plate of a grant of [Siladitya I, *alias* Dharmaditya] of [Gupta-]Samvat 286.

This plate, when I got it in Vaḻā, was covered with thick crust and very few letters could be read, but after it was cleaned by the Archaeological Chemist each and every letter could be very easily read. The surface of the plate is pierced by a number of small holes and is considerably damaged on both sides, especially in the lower corner of the left hand. The two big holes meant for rings in the upper part of the plate are intact, as also is the upper rim.

The plate measures about $10\frac{1}{2}'' \times 7\frac{1}{2}''$ and contains 15 lines of writing. The letters are comparatively of a large size and are distinctly, deeply, and carefully engraved. The writing, therefore, contains few grammatical mistakes.

In the second plate of a Valabhī grant we do not get the name of the grantor king, but from the date 286 we may surmise that he is Śīlāditya I Dharmāditya, three[7] of whose grants of the same year have already been published.

The beneficiary is the Buddhist monastery situated in Vaṅśakaṭa.[8] This monastery, as another grant (No. VIII below) of the same king shows, was built by Śīlāditya I himself.

[7] (*a*) Saṁ. 286 वैशाख ब. ६ {1st plate published in *Ep. Ind.* 11, 115.
2nd ,, ,, *Ind. Ant.* 10, 46.}

(*b*) ,, ,, ज्येष्ठ ब. ६ (*JBBRAS.* 11, 359 and *Ind. Ant.* 14, 327.)

(*c*) ,, ,, आषाढ ब. ८ (*Ep. Ind.* 11, 174.)

[8] This place is referred to in a grant of Saṁ. 375. Cf. *Pkt. and Skt. Inscriptions of Kathiawad*, p. 54.

It is unfortunate that the description of the property granted to the monastery is lost. But it seems to have been situated in the Kalāpaka(?)-pathaka.

The Dūtaka is Bhaṭṭa Ādityayaśas as in the other grants issued in the same year. The name of the writer is not seen but he must be Sandhivigrahādhikṛta-divirapati Vattrabhaṭṭi, who wrote other grants of the king issued in the same year.

Text.

1 युक्तकद्राङ्गिकमहत्तरचाटभटकुमारामात्यादीनन्यंश्च[1] यथाभिसम्बद्ध्यमान
कान्स . . .

2 त्यस्तुवस्संविदितं यथा मया[2] मतापित्रोः पुण्याप्यायनाय **वंशकट**प्राति
. . .

3 रितविहारनिवासिचतुर्द्दिगभ्यागतार्य्यभिक्षुसंघस्य चीवरपिण्डपातश . .
. .

4 [ग्लानप्र]त्यय[भै]षज्यपरिष्कारार्थं बुद्धानाञ्च भगवतां गन्धधूपपुष्पमाल्य-
दीपतैला[द्यु]पयो . . . . .

5 रस्य खण्डस्फु[टि]तप्रतिसंस्काराय कल्पिकारपादमूलप्रजीवनाय च .
. [3] **कपथके** . . . . .

6 सोद्रङ्गस्सोपरिकरस्सवातभूतप्रत्यायस्सधान्यहिरण्यादेयस्सदशापराधस्सोत्पद्य-
[मान]वि . . . .

7 [ज]कीयानामहस्तप्रक्षेपणीयः पूर्व्वप्रत्तदेवब्रह्मदेयवर्जितः भूमिच्छिद्रन्याये-
[नाचन्द्रा] . . . .

8 [नि]सरित्पर्व्वतसमकालीनः अव्यवच्छिन्नभोग्य[:*] धर्म्मदायतया
निसृष्टः यत उचितया देवब्र . . . .

9 . स्थित्या [4]भुज्यमनकः न कैश्चित्परिपन्थनीयः आगामिभद्रनृपतिभि-
रप्यस्मद्वंशजैरन्यैर्व्वा अ . . . .

10 [श्र]वर्य्याण्यस्थिरं मानुष्यं सामान्यञ्च भूमिदानफलमवगच्छद्भिरयम-
स्मद्दायोनुमन्तव्यः . . . . .

11 . . . ति ॥ बहुभिर्व्वसुधा भुक्ता राजभिस्सगरादिभिः यस्य यस्य
यदा भूमिस्तस्य . . .

[1] Read °नन्यांश्च.—[2] Read माता·°—[3] May the name of the *pathaka* be [काल्लाप]क ?—[4] Read भुज्यमानकः.

12 . . . निह दारिद्र्यभयान्नरेन्द्रैर्द्धनानि धर्म्मायतनीकृतानि निर्भुक्त-
माल्यप्रतिमा . .

13 . . धु× पुनराददीत ॥ पष्टिं[5] वर्षसहस्राणि स्वर्गे मोदेत भूमिदः
आ . . . . .

14 . . . नरके वसेत् ॥ दूतकश्चात्र **भट्टादित्ययशाः** ॥
लिखितं सन्धि . . . . .

15 सं २०० ८० ६ श्रावण व ७ ॥ ॥ स्व . . . .

[5] Read षष्टिं.

No. VII.—Two plates making a complete grant of Siladitya I (*alias* Dharmaditya) of [Gupta-]Samvat 287.

The second plate of the present grant is in an excellent state of preservation. While looking for the first plate in the collection I discovered four pieces which when joined together make up the major part of the first plate.

The second plate has the usual Valabhī seal attached. The plates measure $11\frac{1}{4}'' \times 8\frac{3}{4}''$. The first plate seems to have contained 19 lines of writing, while the second one has 17. The letters are clearly and carefully engraved.

The part of the first plate containing the name of the place from where the grant was issued is lost, but it seems to have been Valabhī.

Similar is the case with the name of the grantor king. But from the date 287 in the second plate the grantor must be Śīlāditya I *alias* Dharmāditya, who has also issued grants bearing dates 286[9] (three grants), and 290[10] (two grants); thus the present grant of 287 does not add to our knowledge of the length of his reign.

The grantee is a Brahman named Bhaṭṭi, son of Bhaṭṭaguha, of Bhāradvāja-gotra and a student of the Kauthuma Śākhā of the Sāmaveda, who coming from Ānarttapura had settled in Valabhī.

---

[9] *Ep. Ind.* 11, 115; *Ind. Ant.* 14, 327; and *Ep. Ind.* 11, 174.

[10] *Ind. Ant.* 11, 237; the other preserved in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay, is yet unpublished.

The property granted to him has been thus specified : (1) 120 pādāvarttas (of land) owned by Sīhadatta in the village Kālāsāmaka in the possession of the venerable queen Jañjikā in its north-east quarter ; to the west of the field belonging to Pippala (a resident of the village Puṣyamitra) and of the field belonging to Karkkaka ; to the north of the field belonging to Miśraṇa ; to the east of the field belonging to Dūśaka and of the field belonging to Maṇṇaka ; and to the south of the field owned by the Kaṇabi Vatsa on the boundary of the village Coṭṭiyānaka ; (2) an irrigation well called (saṁśabdita) Mocanikā, covering an area of 16 pādāvarttas owned by the same Sīhadatta in the north-west quarter.

The Dūtaka, who executed this grant, was Bhaṭṭa Ādityayaśas, and it was written by Vattrabhaṭṭi, the Minister for Peace and War and Chief Secretary.

As regards the identification of the localities, it may be said that Valabhī, as I have stated above, is the modern Vaḷā ; and Ānarttapura the modern Vaḍanagar.[11] The other villages cannot be identified.

Text.

First plate.

1 [ओं स्वस्ति **वलभीतः** प्र]सभप्रणतामित्राणां मैत्रकाणामतुलबलसंपन्न-
मण्ड[ला]भोगसंसक्तप्रहारशतलब्धप्रताप-

2 [प्रतापोपनतद]ानमानार्जवोपार्ज्जितानुरागादनुरक्तमौलभृतश्रेणीबलावाप्तरा-
ज्यश्रियः परममाहेश्वर-

3 [**श्रीभटार्क्का**दव्यव]च्छिन्नराजवंशान्मातापितृचरणारविन्दप्रणतिप्रविधौता-
शेषकल्मषः शैशवात्प्रभृति खड्ग-

4 [द्वितीयबाहुरेव समद]परगजघटा[स्फो]टनप्रकाशितसत्त्वनिकषस्तत्प्रभावप्र-
णताराातिचूडारत्नप्रभा-

5 [संसक्तपादनखरश्मि]सङ्घातिस्सकलस्मृतिप्रणीतमार्ग्गसम्यक्पारिपालनप्रजा-
हृदयरंजनान्वर्त्थराज-

6 [शब्दः रूपकान्तिस्थै]र्य्यधैर्य्यगाम्भीर्य्यबुद्धिसम्पद्भिः स्मरशशाङ्काद्रिराजो-
दधि[त्रिद]शगुरुधनेशान-

---

[11] See my note in *Annals of the Bhandarkar Inst.* vol. 4.

7. [तिशयानः शरणाग]ताभयप्रदानपरतया तृणवदपास्ताशेषस्वकार्य्य[फ-]
ल [:*] प्रार्त्थनाधिकार्त्थप्रदाना-

8 [नन्दितविद्वत्सुहृत्प्र]णयिहृदयः सकलभुवनमण्डला[भोगप्र]मोदः परम-
माहेश्वरः

9 [**श्रीगुहसेन**स्तस्य सु]तस्तत्पादनखमयूखसन्तान[वि]सृतजाह्नवी-
जलौघ[प्रक्षालि]ताशेषकल्मषः प्रणयि-

10 [शतसहस्रोपजीव्यमा]नसम्पद्रूपलोभादिवा[श्रितः स]रभसमाभिगा[मिकै-
र्गु]णैस्सहजशक्तिशिक्षाविशे-

11 [षविस्मापिताखिलबलधनुर्द्धरः प्रथमनर]पतिसमतिसृष्टानामनुपा[ल]यिता
धर्म्मदायानामपा-

12 [कर्त्ता प्रजोपघातकारिणामुपप्लवानां दर्श]यिता श्रीसरस्वत्योरेकाधिवा[स-]
स्य संघताराातिपक्ष-

13 [लक्ष्मीपरिभोगदक्षविक्रमो विक्रमोप]संप्राप्तविमलपार्त्थिवश्रीः परममाहे-
[श्वरः **श्रीधर**]**सेन**स्त-

14 [स्य सुतस्तत्पादानुध्यातः सकलज]गदानन्दनात्यद्भुतगुणसमुदयस्थगि-
. . . . .

15 . . प्रद्युतिभासुरतरान्सपीठोदूढगुरुमनोरथम . . . .

16 . . . पिसर्व्वतस्सुभाषितलवेनापि सुखोपपा . . . .

17 . . . योपि सुच . . . .

18 . . . .
. .

19 . . . . [श्री**शीलादित्यः**
कुशली]

Second plate.

20 सर्व्वानेवायुक्तकविनियुक्तकद्राङ्गिकमहत्तरचाटभटकुमारामात्या[दिन्]न्यांश्च
यथाभिसंबद्ध्यमान-

21 कान्समाज्ञापयत्यस्तु वस्संविदितं यथा मया मातापित्रोः पुण्याप्यायनाया-
नर्तपुरविनिर्गत**वलभी**-

22 वास्तव्यभरद्वा[ज]सगोत्त्रच्छान्दोगकौथुमसब्रह्मचारिब्राह्म[ण]भट्टगुहपुत्रभट्टि-
ब्र[ा]ह्मणे राज्ञी जञ्जि(?)

23 कापार्दीय**कालासामक**ग्रामे पूर्व्वोत्तरसीम्नि [**पु**]**ष्यमित्र**ग्रामनिवासि-
पिप्पलसत्कक्षेत्त्रात्कर्क्ककसत्कक्षेत्त्रा-

24 च्चापरतः मिश्रणसत्कक्षेत्रादुत्तरतः तथा दूषकसत्कक्षेत्त्रान्मण्णकसत्कक्षे-
त्राच्च पूर्व्वतः **चोट्टिया-**

25 **नकग्राम**सीम्नि कुटुम्बिवत्सप्रत्ययक्षेत्त्राद्दक्षिणतः सोहदत्तप्रत्ययपादाव-
र्त्तशतं विंशोत्तरं अपरो-

26 त्तरसांम्नि सीहदत्तप्रत्यया एव षोडशपादावर्त्तपरिसरा **मोचनिका**
संशब्दितवापी । एव-

27 मेतद्वापीक्षेत्रं सोद्रङ्गं सोपरिकरं सवातभूतप्रत्यायं सधान्यहिरण्यादेयं
सदशापराधं सोत्प-

28 द्यम[।*]नविष्टीकं सर्व्वराजकीयानामहस्तप्रक्षेपणीयं पूर्व्वप्रत्तदेवब्रह्मदेय-
वर्ज्जितं भु(भू)मि-

29 च्छिद्रन्यायेनाचन्द्रार्क्कार्ण्णवक्षितिसरित्पर्व्वतसमकालीनं पुत्रपौत्रान्वयभोग्य-
मुदकातिसर्ग्गे-

30 ण धर्म्मदायतया निसृष्टं यथास्योचितया ब्रह्मदेयस्थित्या भुजंतᳵ
कृषतᳵकर्षयतः प्रदिशतो वा न कै-

31 श्चिद्व्यासेधे वर्त्तितव्यमागामिभद्रनृपतिभिरप्यस्मद्वंशजैरन्यैर्व्वानित्यान्यै-
श्वर्य्याण्यस्थ(स्थि)रं मानुष्यं सा-

32 मान्यञ्च भूमिद[ा*]नफलमवगच्छद्भिरयमस्मद्दाया(यो)नुमन्तव्यः परि-
पालयितव्यश्चेति ॥ बहुभिर्व्वसुधा

33 भुक्ता राजभिस्सगरादिभिः यस्य यस्थ यदा भूमिस्तस्य तस्य तदा
फलं ॥ यानि(नी)ह दारिद्रयभयान्नरे-

34 न्द्रैर्द्धनानि धर्म्मायतनीकृतानि निर्भुक्तमाल्यप्रतिमानि तानि को
नाम साधुᳵ पुनराददीत ॥ षष्टिं वर्ष-

35 सहस्राणि स्वर्गे मोदेत (मोदति) भूमिदः आच्छेत्ता चानुमन्ता च
तान्येव नरके वसेत् ॥ दूतकश्चात्र **भट्टादित्ययशाः** [।*]

36 लिखितं सन्धिविग्रहाधिकृतदिविरपति**वत्रभट्टिना** ॥ सं २०० ८० ७
मार्ग्गशिर ब ७ ॥ स्वहस्तो मम ॥

No. VIII.—Two Plates making a complete Grant of Sīlāditya I (*alias* Dharmaditya).

These two plates have suffered a little on all their sides. The right hand hole of each plate meant for a ring can be clearly seen. The greatest loss is of the portion containing the year when the

grant was issued. A few letters on the upper side have become very faint. The letters, however, that can be seen are found to be very carefully and beautifully engraved. The grants of Śīlāditya I are generally free from clerical mistakes. This grant, accordingly, contains rarely any mistakes in writing and in engraving.

The plates measure about 11″×8½″. The first plate has 19 lines of writing and the second 17.

The part of the plate containing the name of the place from where the grant was issued is broken away. Similar is the case with that containing the actual name of the king. But a part of his other name is clearly seen in line 19.

This is a Buddhist grant and the beneficiary is the monastery built by the grantor king himself, in the Svaṭala of Vaṁśakaṭa. It will be seen that the same monastery is referred to in another grant of the king of Saṁ. 286 (No. V above). But there the name of the king who built it is not given.

The property granted to the Vihāra consisted of two villages, one of which named Vyāghradinnānaka was situated in °saraka[12] District. The name of the other village as well as of the district in which it was included is illegible.

The Dūtaka is Kharagraha. The writer's name is lost, but from the epithets that are preserved and from other grants of the king we can say that he must be Vattrabhaṭṭi, the Chief Secretary and Minister for Peace and War.

The year and the month when the grant was issued are lost in the broken portion, but the fortnight is preserved. The year of the grant can approximately be found from the fact that the name of the Dūtaka of the present grant, namely, Kharagraha, is found in the grants of Saṁ. 290 but not in those of Saṁ. 286. It is, therefore, one of the later grants of Śīlāditya.

The great importance of the present grant lies in the fact that we know only from this that Śīlāditya himself built a Buddhist monastery (line 22). It seems from this that in later life he embraced Buddhism like Guhasena (*Ind. Ant.* 5, 206).

---

[12] This may possibly be Akṣasaraka, a name which we meet with in many Valabhī grants.

TEXT.

First plate.

1 . . . .

2 . .. . . . मौलभृतश्रेणी . . . . .

3 . . वङ्गान्मातापितृचरणारविन्दप्रणतिप्रविधौताशे .
(शे)

4 . हुरेव समदपरगजघटास्फोटनप्रकाशितसत्वनिकषस्त . . .

5 . . . . संसक्तपादनखरश्मिसंहतिः सकलस्मृतिप्रणीतमार्ग्ग-
सम्यक्प . . .

6 . . राजशब्दः रूपकान्तिस्थैर्य्यधैर्य्यगाम्भीर्य्यबुद्धिसम्पद्भिः स्मर-
शशाङ्काद्रि . . . .

7 शानतिशयानश्शरणागताभयप्रदानपरतया तृणवदपास्ताशेष . . .

8 धिकार्त्थप्रदानानन्दितविद्वत्सुहृत्प्रणयिहृदयः पादचारीव सकलभुवन . . .

9 . . . . . दः परममाहेश्वरः **श्रीगुहसेनस्तस्य** सुतस्तत्पादन-
खमयूखसन्तानवि . . .

10 . . . . . क्षालिताशेषकल्मषः प्रणयिशतसहस्रोपजीव्यमानसम्पद्रू-
पलोभादि . . . . .

11 . . . भिगामिकैर्ग्गुणैस्सहजशक्तिशिक्षाविशेषविस्मापिताखिलबल-
धनुर्द्धर × प्रथम . . .

12 . . . सृष्टानामनुपालयिता धर्म्मदायानामपाकर्त्ता प्रजोपघातकारि-
णामुपप्लवानां द . . .

13 . . त्योरेकाधिवासस्य संहताराातिपक्षलक्ष्मीपरिभोगदक्षविक्रमो
विक्रमसंप्राप्त . . .

14 . श्रीः परममाहेश्वरः **श्रीधरसेनस्तस्य** सुतस्तत्पादानुध्यातस्स-
कलजगदानन्दना . . .

15 . . स्थगितसमग्रदिङ्मण्डलस्समरशतविजयशोभासनाथमण्डलाग्रद्युति-
(म)
भासुर . . .

16 . . . गुरुमनोरथमहाभारः सर्व्वविद्यापरावरविभागाधिगमविमल
मतिरपि स . . .

17 . . नापि सुखोपपादनीयपरितोषः समग्रलोकागाधगाम्भीर्य्यहृदयोपि
सुचरि . .

18 . मकल्याणस्वभावः खिलीभूतकृतयुगनृपतिपथविशोध . . .

19 . . . . . . तार्त्थसुखसम्पदुपसेवानिरूढधर्म्मा[दित्यद्वितीयनामा][1]

. . . . .

Second plate.

20 [**श्रीशीलादित्यः** कुशली सर्व्वानेवायुक्तकविनियुक्त]कद्रा[ङ्गिक] . . .

21 . . . . . . बद्धयमानकान्स . . . . . .

22 . . पुण्याप्यायनाय **वङ्ग्रीकट**[2]स्वतलनिविष्टास्मत्कारितविहार

23 . पिण्डपातशयनासनग्लानप्रत्ययभिषज्यप्रतिस्कारा्य (?)

. . .

24 . स्नानगन्धदीपतैलपुष्पमाल्यवाद्यगीतनृत्याद्युपयोगाय च विहा

. . .

25 . . . .[3]**सरक**पथकान्तर्गत**व्याघ्रदिन्नानकं**[4]। तथा **काल** (?)

26 . **का(?)लण**-मेतद्ग्रामद्वयं सोद्रङ्गं सोपरिकरं सवातभूतप्रत्यायं

. . .

27 . सदशापराधं सोत्पद्यमानविष्टि[कं] सर्व्वराजकीयानामहस्त-प्रक्षेपणीयं . . . . .

28 . . . भूमिच्छिद्रन्यायेनाचन्द्रार्क्कार्ण्णवक्षितिसरित्पर्व्वतसमकालीनं विहारसङ्घ . . . . . .

29 . . उपरिलिखितस्थित्या भुंजमानस्य न कैश्चिद्व्यासेधे वर्त्तितव्यमागामिभद्रनृपति-

30 भि . . . र्व्वा अनित्यान्यैश्वर्य्याण्यस्थिरं मानुष्यं सामान्यं च भूमिदानफलमवगच्छद्भिः

31 . स्मद्वंशजैरन्यैर्वागामिभद्रनृपतिभिरयमस्मद्दायोनुमन्तव्यः परिपालयितव्यश्चेत्युक्तं च भगवता वेदव्यासेन व्यासेन . . .

32 . . . भुक्ता राजभिस्सगरादिभिः यस्य यस्य यदा भूमिस्तस्य तस्य त . . . .

[1] These letters are of course approximately given here.—[2] This name occurs in a grant of Sam. 375 and in No. V above.—[3] Can this be अक्षसरक ? —[4] Expressed by a point.

33 . . यान्नरेन्द्रैर्द्धनानि धर्म्मायतनीकृतानि निर्भुक्त[5]माल्यप्रतिमानि
तानि को नाम सा . . .

34 . . . षष्टिं वर्षसहस्राणि स्वर्गे मोदति भूमिदः आच्छेत्ता
चावमन्ता च ता . . .

35 दूतकोत्र श्रीखरग्रहः ॥ लिखितं सन्धिविग्रहाधिकृतदिविरपति . . .

36 . . . . . हुल ७ स्वहस्तो . . . .

[5] The dot is engraved above the letter र्भु through mistake.

No. IX.—Second plate of a grant of Dhruvasena III.

This plate has suffered much along its margins. Only a small part of the left hand rim has been preserved. No trace of the two holes meant for the copper ring is to be seen on the plate. The serious loss is of the last line which usually contains the date. The plate in its present condition measures about 12″×8″.

The letters were no doubt engraved carefully, but because of the bad condition of the plate, even after it was cleaned by the Archaeological Chemist, they cannot be easily read.

The grant was issued by Dhruvasena III. His actual name is not to be seen on the plate, but most of his introductory descriptive portion has been preserved. He seems to bear no royal titles. Only the religious epithet, *paramamāheśvara*, is used before his name. The beneficiary seems to be the Buddhist monastery built by Ḍuḍḍā in the *svatala* of Valabhī.

A village named Rākṣasaka included in Kāśahṛda (read °hrada) was granted for the maintenance of the inmates of the monastery.

All other details of the grant including the names of the Dūtaka and writer are lost. Of Dhruvasena III we have only one more grant dated Saṁ. 334 (*Ep. Ind.* 1, 85). The late Dr. Bhagvanlal Indraji, in his History of Gujarat, *Bombay Gazetteer*, vol. I, part 1, page 92, refers to "an unpublished copper-plate in the possession of the Chief of Morvi belonging to Dhruvasena III dated A. D. 651 (G. 332)." The grant has never been published and all my efforts to find its whereabouts have proved fruitless.

TEXT.

1 [1]. . . . .

2 [मस्तसामन्त]मण्डलो[त्तमाङ्गधृत]चूडामणीयमानशासनः परममाहेश्वरः [परमभट्टारकमहाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वरचक्रवर्तिश्रीधर]-

3 [**सेन**]स्तत्पितामहभ्रातृश्री**शीलादित्यस्य** शार्ङ्गपाणेरिवाङ्गजन्मनो भक्ति-बन्धुरावयवकल्पितप्रणतेरतिध[वलया दूरं तत्पादारविन्दप्रवृ-]

4 [त्त]या नखमणिरुचा मन्दाकिन्येव नित्यममलितोत्तमाङ्गदेशस्यागस्त्यस्येव राजर्षेर्द्दाक्षिण्यमातन्वानस्य प्रबलधवलिम्ना [यससां वल]-

5 येन मण्डितककुभा नभसि यामिनीपतेर्विरचिताखण्डपरिवेषमण्डलस्य पयोदश्यामशिखरचूचुकरुचिरसह्यविन्ध्यस्तनयुगायाः

6 क्षिते× पत्युः श्री**डेरभटस्या**ङ्गजः क्षितिपसंहतेरनुरागिण्याः शुचिय-शोङ्क[शु]भृतः स्वयंवरमालामिव राज्यश्रियम[र्पयन्त्याः]

7 कृतपरिग्रहः शौर्य्यमप्रतिहतव्यापारमानमितप्रचंडरिपुमण्डलं मण्डलाग्रमि-वावलम्बमानः शरदि प्रसभमाकृष्टशिलीं[मुखबाणा-]

8 [सनापादित]प्रसाधनानां परभुवां विधिवदाचरितकरग्रहणः पूर्व्वमेव विविध-वर्णोज्ज्वलेन श्रुतातिशयेनोद्भासितश्र[वणः पुनः-]

9 [पुनरुक्तेनेव रत्ना]लङ्कारेणालङ्क[कृ]तश्रोत्र(:)परिस्फुरत्कटकविकटकीट-पक्षरत्नकिरणमविच्छिन्नप्रदानसलिलनिवहावसेक-

10 [शैवला]ङ्क[कु]रमिवाग्रपाणिमुद्वहने धृतविशालरत्नवलयजलधिवेलातटायमानभु-जपरिष्वक्तविश्वम्भरः परममाहेश्वर(:)श्री[**ध्रुवसेनः**]

11 [सर्वा]नेव समाज्ञापयत्यस्तु वस्संविदितं यथा मया मातापित्रोऽपुण्या-प्यायनाय श्री**वलभी**स्वतलनिविष्टडुड्डा . . . .

12 [भिक्षुसं]घाय चीवरपिण्डपातशयनासनग्लानभैषज्यार्त्थं भगवतो बुद्ध[2]भट्टार-कस्य पूजास्नपनगन्धपुष्पधूपदीपतैलाद्य[र्थं] . . . .

13 [प्रतिसंस्का]राय भिक्षु[संघस्य च?] पादमूलप्रजीवनाय [**वनौटकान्तर** ?] **काशहृदान्तर्गतराक्षसक**ग्रामस्सोद्रङ्गस्सोपरि[करः]

14 . . . . . ण्यादेयः सदशापराधः सोत्पद्यमानविष्टीकः सर्व्वराज-कीयानामहस्तप्रक्षेपणीयः पूर्व्वप्रत्तदेवब्रह्म . . . .

[1] Illegible. [2] This expression shows that Buddha was then looked upon as an actual deity to be worshipped through the medium of an image. We have several references in Gupta plates to आदित्यभट्टारक and नारायणभट्टारक

15 . . . . सरित्पर्व्वतसमकालीनः अव्यवच्छिन्नभोग्यः उदका-
तिसर्ग्गेण धर्म्मदायो निसृष्टः यतोस्य डुड्डाविहारे . . .

16 . . . . . भुंजतः कृषतः कर्षयतः कर्षापयतो वा न कैश्चिद्व्या-
षेधे [वर्त्तितव्य]मागामिभद्रनृपतिभिः अ . . .

17 .[3] . . . .

18 . . . .

[3] Illegible.

No. X.—Second plate of a grant of Siladitya III : [Gupta-]Samvat 343.

This plate is damaged on all its sides, especially on the left and right hand sides. It was covered with a thick crust of verdigris, but after it was cleaned by the Archaeological Chemist most of the letters could be deciphered with some certainty.

The plate measures 11½″×11½″, and contains 31 lines of writing, which, it will be seen, is almost free from grammatical mistakes.

The plate begins with the description of Dharasena IV. All the introductory portion up to the description of the grantor king Śīlāditya III is practically identical with that in the following grant, and with another grant of Saṁ. 356 from the Bhavnagar Museum, also published below.

The beneficiary is the Buddhist monastery built by the Ācārya Bhikṣu Vimalagupta of the village Kukkurāṇaka, and located inside the monastery of the Ācārya Bhikṣu Sthiramati, included in the outskirts of the Ḍuḍḍā-vihāra. This monastery of Vimalagupta is referred to again in another grant of Saṁvat 356 published below. It is known to us only from these two grants. It seems that the Ḍuḍḍā-vihāra was a very large monastery, having an extensive compound within which were built several other smaller monasteries.

The name of the village granted to the Vihāra cannot be clearly read, but it appears to be Sīhāṇaka and was included in the Bāvasanaka(?)-sthalī in Surāṣṭra.

The purpose for which the grant was made is the usual one in the Buddhist grants.

The name of the Dūtaka cannot be read, but that of the writer of the grant is Aṇahila, the official referred to in other grants of the same king. The date of the grant, which narrowly escaped destruction, is Saṁ. 343 and is, as shown above in the introduction, the earliest one for Śīlāditya III. Another grant of his, dated Saṁ. 356, will be found published below. Other dates of the king found from his copper-plates are 346, 347, 348 (all unpublished), 350 (*Ep. Ind.* 4, 76), 352 (*Ind. Ant.* 11, 305), and 365 (*JASB.* 7, 966).

TEXT.

1 .[1] . . . .

2 महाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वरचक्रवर्त्तिश्रीध्रुव . . . . .

3 . . . . . दूरं तत्पादारविन्दप्रवृत्तया नखमणिरुचा मन्दाकिन्येव [नि]त्य . . . . .

4 . . . . . . [दाक्षिण्यमातन्वानस्य प्रबलधव]लिम्ना यशसां वलयेन मण्डितककुभो . . . . .

5 स्याङ्गजः क्षितिपसंहतेरनुरागिण्याः शुचियशो[2]ङ्कु(शु)कभृत. स्वयं . . . .

6 चण्डरिपुमण्डलं मण्डलाग्रमिवावलम्बमानः शरदि प्रसभमाकृष्टशिलीमु . . . . .

7 . . हणः पूर्व्वमेव विविधवर्ण्णोज्वलेन श्रुतातिशयेनोद्भासितश्रवणः पु[नः] . . . . .

8 . . त्नकिरणमविच्छिन्नप्रदानसलिलनिवहावसेकविलसन्नवशैवलाङ्कु(कु)रमिवाग्रपाणिमुद्वह . . . . . .

9 च्वक्तविश्वम्भरः परममाहेश्वरः श्रीध्रुवसेनस्तस्याग्रजो[3] परमहीपतिस्पर्शदोषनास[4]नधियेव

10 चिरतरचरितगरिमपरिकलितसकलनरपतिरतिप्रकृष्टानुरागरसरभसवशीकृतप्र[णतसमस्त] . . . . .

11 . . मलयुगलः प्रोद्दामोदारदोर्द्दण्डदलितद्विषद्वर्ग्गदर्प्पः प्रसर्प्पत्पटीयः प्रतापप्लो[षिताशेषशत्रुव] . . . . .

[1] Illegible.—[2] Read ०यशोंशुक०.—[3] Read ०ग्रजः.—[4] Read नाश०.

12 . . सुदर्शनचक्रः परिहृतबालक्रीडोनध×कृतद्विजातिरेकविक्रमप्रसाधितध-
रित्रीं[तलोनङ्गीकृतजल] . . . .

13 . . म्यग्व्यवस्थापितवर्ण्णाश्रमाचारः पूर्वैरप्यूर्व्वीपतिभिस्त्रि[5]ष्णालवलुब्धै-
र्य्यान्यपहृतानि [देवब्रह्मदेयानि] . . . . . .

14 . . . . . ङ्कलनानुमोदनाभ्यां परिमुदितत्रिभुवनाभिनन्दितोच्छ्रि-
तोत्कृष्टधवलधर्म्मध्वजप्र[काशितनिजवङ्शो] . . .

15 . . . . . त्तितमहोद्रङ्गादिदानव्यसनानुपजातसन्तोषोपात्तोदार
कीर्त्ति[6] पंक्तिपरंपरादन्तु[रितनिखिल] . . .

16 . . . . . मा परममाहेश्वरः श्री**खरग्रह**स्तस्याग्रजन्मन×कुमुद-
षण्डश्रीविकासिन्या कलावतश्चन्द्रि[कयेव कीर्त्या] . . .

17 . . . . . लेपनपिण्डश्यामलविन्ध्यशैलविपुलपयोधराभोगायाः
क्षोण्या× पत्युः श्री**शीलादित्यस्य** [सूनु] . . . .

18 . . . . . नकलाचक्रवाल× केस[रीन्द्र]शिशु[रि]व राजलक्ष्मी
मचलवनस्थलीमिवालङ्कुर्व्वाणः शिखण्डिकेतन इव रुचि[मच्चूडा]
. . . . .

19 . . . . गम इव प्रतापवानुल्लसत्पद्मसंयुगे विदलयन्नम्भोधरानिव
परगजानुदय एव तपनबाला . . . . . .

20 . . . . . द्विषतां परममाहे[श्वरः] श्री**शीलादित्य×** कुशली
सर्व्वानेव समाज्ञापयत्यस्तु वस्संविदितं य . . या मा
. . . .

21 . . . **डुड्डाविहार**[मण्डलान्तर्गता]चार्य्यभिक्षु**स्थिरमति**-
कारितविहारे आचार्य्यभिक्षु**विमलगुप्त**कारि[तभगव] . . .

22 . . . . डुड्डाविहारमण्डल[प्रावेश्य]**कुक्कुराणकग्राम**निविष्टाचार्य्य
भिक्षुविमलगुप्तकारित[विहारे] . . .

23 . . . भैषज्यचावरिकाद्युपयोगाय . . संबुद्धां च
भगवतां बुद्धानां गन्धधूपपुष्प . . .

24 . . . . स्य खण्डस्फुटितप्रतिसंस्करणार्थं **सुराष्ट्रेषु[बावस-
नक(?)]** स्थल्यां सीहाणक(?)ग्रामः [सोद्रङ्गः] . . .

25 . . . . सोत्पद्यमानविष्टिकः सर्व्वराजकीयानामहस्तप्रक्षेपणी[यः
पूर्व्व] . . . .

[5] Read ०स्तृष्णा.—[6] Read ०कीर्त्तिः.

26 . . . . . [सरित्प]व्वतसमकालीन उदकातिसर्ग्गेण धर्म्मदायो निसृष्टो [यतो] . . . . . .

27 . . . [मिभद्रनृ]पतिभिरस्मद्वङ्शजैरन्यैश्च अनित्यान्यैश्वर्य्या [ण्यस्थिरं] . . . . . .

28 . . . . . [श्चेत्यु]क्तञ्च ॥ बहुभिर्व्वसुधा भुक्ता राजभिस्सगरा-दिभि: . . . . . .

29 . . [यतनीकृ]तानि निर्भुक्तमाल्यप्रतिमानि तानि [को नाम] . . .

30 . . [द]**नाहिलेने**[ति] ॥ सं ३०० ४० ३ द्वि आषाड व . . . .

No. XI.—Second plate of a grant of Siladitya III.

This plate is broken along its sides, and its surface is pierced by large holes. The most serious loss is that of the concluding portion which usually contains the date. The portion containing the description of the property granted is also broken away. The plate measures approximately 15″×10½″.

The letters are very distinctly and carefully engraved, and no difficulty is experienced in reading them, whenever the portion of the plate is in good condition. The inscription is comparatively free from grammatical mistakes.

The grant is issued by Śīlāditya III, who is called only *paramamāheśvara* and bears no royal titles.

The beneficiary is some Buddhist monastery included in the monastery of the queen Duḍḍā, situated on the other side of Valabhī.

No other details of the grant are available.

Text.

1 [[1]प्रदानसलिलक्षालिताग्रहस्तारविन्द: कन्याया इव मृदुक]रग्रहणादमन्दीकृतानन्दविधिर्व्वसुन्धराया× कार्म्मुकधनुर्व्वेद इव संभाविता[शेषलक्ष्यकलाप:].

[1] The plate begins with the first part of the description of Dharasena V, exactly as in the previous plate of the same king.

2 [[2]प्रणतसमस्तसामन्तमण्डलोत्तमाङ्गधृतचूडामणीय]मानशासनः परममाहे-
श्वरपरमभट्टारकमहाराजाधिराजपरमेश्व[रचक्रवर्त्तिश्री**धर**-]

3 **सेन**स्तत्पितामहभ्रातृश्री**शीलादित्य**स्य शार्ङ्गपाणेरि]वाङ्गजन्मनो भक्ति-
बन्धुरावयवकल्पितप्रणतेरतिधवलया तत्पा[दारविन्दप्रवृत्तया]

4 चरणनखमणिरुचा मन्दाकिन्येव नित्यममलि]तोत्तमाङ्गदेशस्यागस्त्यस्येव
राजर्षेर्द्दाक्षिण्यमातन्वानस्य प्रबलधवलिम्ना [यशसां वलयेन]

5 मण्डितककुभा नभसि यामिनीपतेर्व्विरचिताखण्डपरिवेषमण्डलस्य पयोद-
श्यामशिखरचू[चु]करुचिरसह्यविन्ध्य[3]स्तनयुगा[याः क्षितेः पत्युः
श्री**देर**-]

6 [**भट**स्याङ्गजः क्षितिपसंहतेर]नुरागिण्या[4] शुचिर्य[5]शोङ्कुकभृतः [5a]स्वय-
वरमालामिव राज्यश्रियमर्प्पयन्त्या× कृतपरिग्रहः [शौर्य]मप्र[तिह-
तव्यापार-]

7 [मानमितप्रचण्डरिपुमण्डलं] मण्डलाग्रमिवावलम्बमानः शरदि प्रसभमा-
क्रिष्ट[6]शिलीमुखबाणासनापादितप्र[साधनानां परभुवां]

8 [विधिवदाचरितकर]ग्रहणा[7] पूर्व्वमेव विविधवर्ण्णोज्वलेन श्रुतातिशयेनोद्भा-
सितश्रवणयुगलः पुनःपुनरुक्तेनेव रत्नालङ्कारेण नालंकृ[तश्रोत्रः]

9 [परिस्फुरत्क]टकविकटकीटपक्षरत्नकिरणमविच्छिन्नप्रदानसलिलनिवहावशेक[8]-
विलसन्नवशैवलाङ्कुरमिवाग्रपाणिमुद्वहन् धृतविशा-

10 [लरत्न]वलयजलधिवेलातटायमानभुजपरिष्वक्तविश्वम्भरः परममाहेश्वरः
श्री**ध्रुवसेन**स्तस्याग्रजो[9] परमहीपतिस्पर्शदोषनाश-

11 [धि]येव लक्ष्म्या स्वयमपि स्पष्टचेष्टमाश्लिष्टाङ्गयष्टिरतिरुचिरतरचारितगरि-
मपरिकलितसकलनरपतिरतिप्रकृष्टानुरागसरभ-

12 [स]वशीकृतप्रणतसमस्तसामन्तचक्रचूडामणिमयूखखचितचरणकमलयुगलः
प्रोद्दामोदारदोर्द्दण्डदलितद्विषद्वर्ग्गदर्पः प्रसर्प-

13 [त्प]टीयः प्रतापप्लोषिताशेषशत्रुवङ्शः[10] प्रणयिपक्षनिक्षिप्तलक्ष्मीकः प्रेरित-
गदोत्क्षिप्तसुदर्शनचक्रः परिहृतबालक्रीडः अनध कृत-

14 [द्विजा]तिरेकविक्रमप्रसाधितधरित्रीतलः अनङ्गीकृतजलशय्योपूर्व्वपुरुषोत्तमः
साक्षाद्धर्म्म इव सम्यग्व्यवस्थापितवर्णाश्रमाचारः पूर्व्वैरप्यूर्वीपति-

[2] These letters are put in by calculation.—[3] Read °विन्ध्य.°—[4] Read °रागिण्याः.—[5] Read° यशोंशुक°.—[5a] Read स्वयं°.—[6] Read °कृष्ट°.—[7] Read °ग्रहणः.—[8] Read °वसेक°.—[9] Read °ग्रजः.—[10] Read °वंशः.

15 [भिस्तृ]ष्णालवलुब्धैर्य्यान्यपहृतानि देवब्राह्म[ण]देयानि तेषामप्यतिसरलमनः प्रसरमुत्सङ्कलनानुमोदनाभ्या[11]म्परिमुदितत्रिभुवनाभि-

16 [नन्दितो]च्छ्रितोत्कृष्टधवलधर्म्मध्वजप्रकाशितनिजव[12]ङ्शो देवद्विजगुरून्प्रति-पूज्ययथार्हमनवरतप्रवर्तितमहोद्रङ्गादिदानव्यवस्थोपजातसन्तोषो-

17 [पात्तोदा]रकीर्त्तिपरंपरादन्तुरितनिखिलदिक्चक्रवालः स्पष्टमेव यथार्थं **धर्म्मादित्या**परनामा परममाहेश्वरः श्री**खरग्रह**स्तस्याग्रजन्मनः कुमुदखण्डश्रीविकासि-

18 [न्या कलाव]तश्चन्द्रिकयेव कीर्त्या धवलितसकलदिङ्मण्डलस्य खण्डितागुरु-विलेपनपिण्डश्यामलविन्ध्यशैलविपुलपयोधराभोगायाः क्षोण्याः पत्युः श्री**शीलादित्य**स्य सू-

19 [नु]र्न्नवप्रालेयकि[र]ण इव प्रतिदिनसंवर्द्धमानकलाचक्रवालः केसरीन्द्रशिशुरिव राजलक्ष्मीमचलवनस्थलीमिवालङ्कुर्व्वाणः शिखण्डिकेतन इव रुचि-

20 [मच्चू]डामण्डन[13] प्रचण्डशक्तिप्रतापश्च शरदागम इव प्रतापवानुल्लसत्पद्मः संयुगे विदलयनम्भो[14]धरानिव परगजानुदय एव तपन बा-

21 [लात]प इव संग्रामे मुष्णान्न[15]भिमुखानामायून्सि[16] द्विषतां [पर]ममाहेश्वरः श्री**शीलादित्य**ःकुशलीसर्व्वानेव समाज्ञापयत्यस्तु वस्संविदितंयथा

22 [मा]तापित्रोः पुण्याप्यायनय[17] श्री**वलभ्य**भ्यन्तरिकायां सन्निविष्टराज्ञी-डुड्डाकारितडुडा[18]विहारनिवासिविहारनिवा[19]सिचतुर्द्दिशाभ्यागता

23 [र्य्यभि]क्षुसङ्घाय शयनासनग्लानभैषज्यचीवरिकपिण्ड . . त्यर्थं भगवतां च बुद्धानां पूजास्नपनगन्ध . . . . प-

24 [तै]लाद्यर्थं विहारप्र[तिबद्धपा]दमूल[. उ?प्र]जीवनाय विहार[स्य] खण्ड-स्फुटित[प्रति]संस्कार[20]णाय **सुरा[ष्ट्रेषु]**

25 . . . सोद्रङ्गः सोपरिकरः सभूतवात . . न्यहि-रण्यादेयः सदशापराधः सोत्प

26 [21]

27 . . . . . .

[11] Read मोदनाभ्यां° परि°.—[12] Read °वंशो.—[13] Read °मण्डनः.—[14] Read °न्नम्भो°.—[15] Read मुष्णन्न°.—[16] Read °मायूंषि.—[17] Read °प्यायनाय.—[18] Read डुड्डा.—[19] The phrase विहारनिवासि is apparently repeated here by mistake.—[20] Read संस्करणाय.—[21] Illegible.

No. XII.—First plate of a Valabhi grant.

This plate, which is brittle, is damaged on both its sides, at its lower edge and cracked in the middle. The edges of the plate are fashioned into rims. It measures 8⅜″×11¼″, and contains 18 lines of writing.

The letters are comparatively of a large size and are neatly engraved. The writing is almost free from grammatical mistakes.

The grant, which was issued from Valabhī, breaks off in the latter part of the description of Śīlāditya Dharmāditya with the word धर्म्मानुपरोधो. Hence by reference to other plates giving the full description of this king we can say that the second plate of this grant must begin with :

ज्ज्वलतरीकृतार्त्थसुखसंपदुपसेवानिरूढधर्म्मादित्यद्वितीयनामा परममाहेश्वरश्री-
शीलादित्यः ।

This plate is probably the first half of a grant of Śīlāditya I, the first plates of whose grants end as the present grant does. The measurements, lines, etc., are also very similar to those of his plates as, for instance, the grant of Saṁ. 287 above.

Text.

1 ओं स्वस्ति **वलभीतः** प्रसभप्रणतामित्राणां मैत्रकाणामतुलबलसम्पन्नमण्ड-
लाभोगसंसक्तप्रहार-

2 शतलब्धप्रतापः प्रतापोपनतदानमानार्ज्जवोपार्ज्जितानुरक्तमौलभृतश्रेणी-
बलावाप्तरा-

3 ज्यश्रीः परममाहेश्वरश्री**भटार्क्का**दव्यवच्छिन्नराजवङ्शान्मातापितृचरणार-
विन्दप्रणतिप्रविधौताशेष-

4 कल्मषश्शैशवात्प्रभृति खड्गद्वितीयबाहुरेव समदपरगजघटास्फोटनप्रकाशित-
सत्वनिकषस्तत्प्रभा-

5 वप्रणताराातिचूडारत्नप्रभासंसक्तपादनखरश्मिसंहतिस्सकलस्मृतिप्रणीतमार्ग्ग-
सम्यक्परिपालन-

6 प्रजाहृदयरञ्जनान्वर्त्थराजशब्दः रूपकान्तिस्थैर्य्यगाम्भीर्य्यबुद्धिसम्पद्भिस्स्म-
रशशाङ्काद्रि-

7 [राजो]दधित्रिदशगुरुधनेशानतिशयानश्शरणागताभयप्रदानपरतया तृण-
वदपास्ताशेष-

8 [स्वकार्य्यफलः] प्रार्थनाधिकार्थप्रदानानन्दितविद्वत्सुहृत्प्रणयिहृदयः पाद-
चारीव सकलभुवन-

9 [मण्डलाभो]गप्रमोदᳲ परममाहेश्वरः श्री**गुहसेन**स्तस्य सुतस्तत्पाद-
नखमयूखसन्तानविसृत-

10 [जाह्नवीजलौ]घप्रक्षालिताशेषकल्मषᳲ प्रणयिशतसहस्रोपजीव्यमानस-
म्पद्रूपलोभादिवाश्रित-

11 [स्सरभस]माभिगामिकैर्ग्गुणैस्सहजशक्तिशि[क्षाविशेषविस्मा]पिताखिलध-
[नुर्द्धरः प्रथमनरपति-]

12 [समतिसृष्टा]नामनुपालयिता धर्म्मदायानामपाकर्त्ता प्रजोपघातकारिणामुप-
प्लवानां दर्श-

13 [यिता श्रीसरस्वत्यो]रेकाधिवासस्य संहताराातिपक्षलक्ष्मीपरि[भोगदक्षविक्र-
मो विक्रमोपसंप्रा-]

14 [प्तविमलपार्थिव]श्रीः परममाहेश्वरः श्री**धरसेन**स्तस्य सुतस्तत्पादानु-
द्ध्यातस्स-

15 [जगदानन्दनात्यद्भु]तगुणसमुदयस्थगितसमग्रदिग्मण्डलस्समरशतविशद-
[शोभासनाथ-]

16 [मण्डलाग्रद्युतिभा]सुरांसपीठो व्यूढगुरुमनोरथमहाभारस्सर्व्वविद्यापरापर-
[विभागाधि-]

17 [गमविमलमतिरपि स]र्व्वतस्सुभाषितलवेनापि सुखोपपादनीयपरितोष-
स्समग्र[लोकागाध-]

18 [गाम्भीर्य्यहृदयो]पि सुचरितातिशयसुव्यक्तपरमकल्याणस्वभावः [खिली-]

19 [भूतकृतयुग]नृपतिपथविशोधनाधिगतोदग्रकीर्त्तिर्धर्म्मानुपरोधो

No. XIII.—First plate of a Valabhi grant.

A little portion of the plate on the right hand side is broken away. Also a small cut is made in the left hand side, consequently a few letters are lost at the beginning of each line from the eleventh on. The plate is otherwise complete. The distance between the two holes at the bottom, intended to receive the rings, is $7\frac{3}{4}''$. The plate measures $8\frac{3}{4}'' \times 13''$, and contains 20 lines of writing.

The letters have become rather indistinct and can be read only with difficulty.

The inscription breaks off in the beginning of the description of Dharasena III, ending probably with the words **विगतानुसंधान-माहितारातिपक्ष**. The second plate must therefore begin with something like **मनोरथाक्षभंगः सम्यगुपलक्षितानेक°**.

This plate ends with the portion with which the first plates of Dhruvasena II usually do ; see e.g. No. XVII below.

Text.

1 ओं स्वस्ति **स्कन्धावारात्** . . . वासकात् प्रसभप्रणतामि-
त्राणां मैत्रकाणामतुलबलसंपन्नमण्डलाभोगसंसक्तप्रहारशतलब्ध-
प्रताप-

2 प्रतापोपनतदानमानार्ज्जवोपार्जितानुरागादनुरक्तमौलभृतश्रेणीबलावाप्तराज्य-
श्रियः परममाहेश्वरश्री**भटार्क्का**दव्यवच्छिन्नराजव-[1]

3 शान्मातापितृचरणारविन्दप्रणतिप्रविधौताशेषकल्मषः शैशवात्प्रभृति खड्गद्वि-
तीयबाहुरेव समदपरगजघटास्फोटनप्रकाशितसत्वनिक-

4 [2]शस्तत्प्रभावप्रणताराातिचूडारत्नप्रभासंसक्तपादनखरश्मिसंहतिः सकलस्मृ-
तिप्रणीतमार्गसम्यक्परिपालनप्रजाहृदयरञ्जनान्वर्थ-

5 राजशद्वः रूपकान्तिस्थैर्य्यधैर्य्यगाम्भीर्य्यशुद्धिसम्पद्भिः स्मरशशाङ्काद्रिराजो-
दधित्रिदशगुरुधनेशानतिशयानः शरणागताभयप्रदानपरत-

6 या तृणवदपास्ताशेषस्वकार्य्यफल[3]प्रार्थनाधिकार्थप्रदानानन्दितविद्वत्सुहृत्प्रण-
यिहृदयः पादचारीव सकलभुवनमण्डलाभोग-

7 प्रमोदः परममाहेश्वरः श्री**गुहसेन**स्तस्य सुतस्तत्पादनखमयूखसंतान-
विसृतजाह्नवीजलौघप्रक्षालिताशेषकल्मषः प्रणयिशतस-

8 हस्रोपजीव्यमानसम्पद्रूपलोभादिवाश्रितः सरभसमाभिगामिकैर्ग्गुणैस्सहजश-
क्तिशिक्षाविशेषविस्मापिताखिलधनुर्द्धरः प्रथमनरप-

9 तिसमतिसृष्टानामनुपालयिता धर्म्मदायानामपाकर्ता प्रजोपघातकारिणामुपप्ल-
वानां दर्शयिता श्रीसरस्वत्योरेकाधिवासस्य संहताराातिपक्ष-

10 लक्ष्मीपरिभोगदक्षविक्रमो विक्रमोपसंप्राप्तविमलपार्थिवश्रीः परममाहेश्वरः
श्री**धरसेन**स्तस्य सुतस्तत्पादानुद्ध्यातः सकलजगदानन्द-

[1] Read °वंशा°.—[2] Read निकष°.—[3] Read °फलः.

11 [ना]त्यद्भुतगुणसमुदयस्थगितसमग्रदिङ्मण्डल: समरशतविजयशोभासनाथ-
मण्डलाग्रद्युतिभासुरतरान्स[4]पीठोदूढगुरुमनोर[थ-]

12 [म]हाभार: सर्व्वविद्यापरापरविभागाधिगमविमलमतिरपि सर्व्वत: सुभा-
षितलवेनापि सुखोपपादनीयपरितोष: समग्रलोका[गाध-]

13 [गा]म्भीर्य्यहृदयोपि सुचरितातिशयसुव्यक्तपरमकल्याणस्वभाव: खिली
भूतकृतयुगनृपतिपथविशोधनाधिगतो[दग्रकीर्ति:]

14 [ध]र्म्मानुपरोधोज्ज्वलतरीकृतार्त्थसुखसंपदुपसेवानिरूढ**धर्म्मादित्य**नामा
परममाहेश्वर: श्री**शीलादित्य**: तस्या[नुजस्तत्पादानु-]

15 [द्ध्या]त: स्वयमुपेन्द्रगुरुणेव गुरुणात्यादरवता समभिलषणीयामपि राज-
लक्ष्मीं स्कन्धासक्तां परमभद्र इव [धुर्य्यस्तदाज्ञासम्पादनैक-]

16 [क]रसतयेवोद्वहन्खेदसुखरतिभ्यामनायासितसत्त्वसम्पत्ति: प्रणतिमेकां
परित्यज्य प्रख्यातपौरुषाभिमानैरप्यरातिभिरनासादित-

17 प्रतिक्रियोपाय: कृतनिखिलभुवनामोदविमलगुणसंहाति[5] [6]प्रषभविघटित-
सकलकलिविलसितगति: नीचजनाधिरोहिभिरशेषै-

18 र्द्दोषैरनामृष्टात्युन्नतहृदय: प्रख्यातपौरुषास्त्रकौशलातिशयगणतिथविपक्षक्षिति-
पतिलक्ष्मीस्वयंग्रहप्रकाशितप्र-

19 वीरपुरुषप्रथमसंख्याधिगम: परममाहेश्वर: श्री**खरग्रह**स्तस्य तनयस्तत्पादा-
नुद्ध्यात: सकलविद्याधिगमविहितनिखिल-

20 विद्वज्जनमन:परितोषातिशय: सत्त्वसंपदा त्यागौदार्य्येण च विगतानुसं-
धानमाहितारातिपक्ष

[4] Read °तरांस°.—[5] Read °संहति:.—[6] Read °प्रसभ°.

No. XIV.—First plate of a Valabhi grant.

This plate is the first half of a Valabhī grant, issued by one of the later kings of the dynasty as is seen from its size, the number of lines it contains and from its contents which, it will be seen, ends with the description of Dharasena IV. It is intact on all its sides but not less than four large holes and some small ones pierce the body of the plate. The greater part of the plate, especially at the right hand side, is covered with a thick crust of verdigris, which cannot be removed in any way. Fortunately a few letters at the beginning of each line are visible. The plate measures $14\frac{1}{2}'' \times 12\frac{1}{4}''$ and is pierced by two big holes at the bot-

tom, meant for the copper rings, which are missing. Instead of putting down conjecturally the letters which are hidden under the crust I give below only the letters at the beginning of each line which are legible. For the rest of the text the reader may refer to any similar first plate, for instance, the one in the grant of Saṁ. 356, published below.

TEXT.

1 [ओं स्वस्ति **विजयस्कन्धावारात्** पु]लेण्डक (?)[वासकात्] . . .
2 पनतदानमानार्ज्जवोपार्ज्जितानुरागा . . . . .
3 विन्दप्रणतिप्रविधौताशेष . . . . .
4 चूडारत्नप्रभासंसक्तपादनख . . . .
5 स्थैर्य्यधैर्य्यगाम्भीर्यबुद्धिसंपद्भिः . . . . .
6 र्य्यफलः प्रार्थनाधिकार्त्थप्रदानानन्दित . . . .
7 पादनखमयूखसंतानविसृत . . . . .
8 गुणैस्सहजशक्तिशिक्षाविशेष . . . . .
9 रिणामुपप्लवानां दर्शयिता . . . . .
10 ममाहेश्वरः[1] श्री**धरसेन**स्तस्य सुत . . . . .
11 सनाथमण्डलाग्रद्युतिभासुर . . . .
12 लवेनापि सुखोपपादनीयपरितोषः . .
13 नृपतिपथविशोधनाधिगतोदग्रकीर्ति . . .
14 [2]**दित्य**स्तस्यानुजस्तत्पादानुद्धयात . . . .
15 संपादनैकरसतयैवोद्वह . . . . .
16 परावज्ञाभिमानरसानामालिङ्गितमनोवृत्तिः . .
17 नामोदविमलगुणसंहतिः . . . .
18 रुषास्त्रकौशलातिशयगणातिथविपक्ष . . . . .
19 तस्य[3] तनय[4]स्तत्पादानुध्यातः . . . . .
20 नासमाहितारातिपक्षमनोरथाक्षभङ्गः . . . . .
21 विनयशोभाविभूषणः समरशत . . . . .
22 भूतास्त्रकौशलाभिमान . . . . .

[1] Dharasena II. —[2] This is Śīlāditya I alias Dharmāditya.—[3] This is Khargraha, the younger brother of Śīlāditya I.—[4] This is Dharasena III.

23 सकलपूर्व्वनरपतिरतिदुस्साधनानामपि .

24 रिव स्वयमभ्युपपन्नः प्रकृतिभि

25 न्सितध्वान्तराशिः सततोदितसविता

26 विग्रहसमासनिश्चयनिपुणः . . .

27 रुभयोरपि निष्णातः प्रकृष्टविक्रमोपि

28 वतामुदयः समयसमुपजनित

29 [5]श्रीध्रुवसेनस्तस्य सुत . . . .

30 एव श्रवणनिहितमौक्तिकालङ्कार .

31 [6]मृदुकरग्रहणादमन्दीकृतानन्द . . . . .

[5] This is Dhruvasena II.—[6] This is a part of the introductory description of Dharasena IV.

No. XV.—A piece of the first plate of a Valabhi grant.

This is a small piece of a big copper-plate, the first of a grant of a later Valabhī ruler. It does not give us any important information as it is damaged on all its sides. The piece, as it stands, is however in a rather good state of preservation and the letters can for the most part be read with ease wherever they have been preserved. The piece ends with the description of Dhruvasena II Bālāditya.

Text.

1 [1] . . . .

2 . . . .

3 . . त्तविमलपार्थिवश्रीः परममाहेश्वरश्रीधर[2] . .

4 . . लत्समरशतविजयशोभासनाथमण्डल.

5 त्रेमलमतिरपि सर्वतः सुभाषितलवेनापि सुखो .

6 . परमकल्याणस्वभावः खिलीभूतकृतयुग .

7 . रूढधर्मादित्यद्वितीयनामा परममाहेश्वर[3]. .

8 . समभिलषणीयामपि राजलक्ष्मीं स्कन्धासक्त . .

9 . सत्वसंपत्तिः प्रभावसंपद्वशीकृतनृपति. . . . . .

[1] Lines 1 and 2 illegible.—[2] He must be Dharasena II.—[3] Śilāditya I.

10 . . . . त्यज्यप्रख्यातपौरुषाभिमानैरप्य . .
11 . . . . सकलकलिविलसितगतिर्नीचजना . . .
12 . . गणतिथविपक्षक्षितिपति . . . .
13 [4] . . . .
14 [5] . . . .
15 . . . शोभाविभूषणः समरशत
16 . . परिभूतास्त्रकौशलाभिमान[6] . . . . .
17 . . . . यिता विषयाणां . . . . . .
18 . . . . [7]

[4] This line must contain the name of Kharagraha.—[5] Illegible.—[6] This lacuna must contain the name of Dharasena III.—[7] Here at the end must be the descriptive portion of Dhruvasena II Bālāditya.

No. XVI.—A Piece of the First Plate of a Valabhi Grant.

This is a piece of a big Valabhī plate, the first half of a grant issued by one of the later rulers of the dynasty. The piece which is damaged on all its sides, is full of small holes and is moreover in an extremely brittle condition. The letters which are of a large size are well engraved and, wherever preserved, can be read without difficulty.

Text.

1 . . . परितोषा . . . . .
2 . . शास्त्रकलालोक . . . .
3 . . . . प्रत्यलोदग्रबाहु . . . .
4 . कलनृपतिमण्डलाभिनन्दितशासनः . .
5 . . . . पतिरपि दुस्साधानाम् प्रसाधयिता . . .
6 . . . . . . न्नः प्रकृतिभिरधिगतकलाकलाप × कान्तिमा .
8 . . न्सितध्वान्तराशिः सततोदितसविता प्रकृतिभ्यः परंप्र- . . .
9 सन्धिविग्रहसमासनिश्चयनिपुण स्थानेनुरूपमादेशं . . . .
10 रुभयोर[पि नि]ष्णातः प्रकृष्टविक्रमोपि करुणामृदुहृद . . . . .
11 दोषवतामुदयसमुपज[नित]जनतानुरागप . . . . . .
12 हेश्वरश्रीध्रुवसेनस्तस्य [सुतस्त]त्पादकमल . . . . .
13 . . . . . विभ्रममल . . . .

§ 2

COPPER-PLATES IN THE BHAVNAGAR MUSEUM

The Barton Museum at Bhavnagar in Kathiavad possesses 9 grants of the rulers of Valabhī: five[13] of them have already been published, two[14] more are in the hands of Mr. R. D. Banerji for publication, and the remaining two were found by me to be yet unpublished. The Hon. Secretary of the Museum was kind enough to lend these two to me for the purpose of publication.

One of the two grants is complete; the other, which is incomplete, consists of the second half only. The first half of the second grant has been lying, also unpublished, in the Watson Museum at Rajkot. The second grant, thus completed, forms the basis of the second article.

The first grant is dated Saṁ. 313, and the second one is dated Saṁ. 356. These dates, as will be seen below, are quite new to us. The grants, in fact, give us very valuable information.

NO. XVII.—GORAS COPPER-PLATES OF DHRUVASENA II: [GUPTA-]SAMVAT 313.

These two plates, making a complete grant, were discovered in 1908 in the village called Goras in the Mahuva District of the Bhavnagar State in Kathiavad, and have been preserved in the Barton Museum, Bhavnagar.

These plates, which are in excellent state of preservation, weigh about 16 lbs. They have been joined together by the usual seal of the Valabhī kings. They are inscribed as usual on one side only and measure 15½″ × 11¼″. Their edges are fashioned into deep rims on the four margins to protect the writing. There are 24 lines of writing in the first plate, and 25 in the second.

---

13 (*a*) Katpur grant of Saṁ. 252 (*Skt. and Pkt. Inscr. of Kathiawad,* p. 35).
(*b*) Botad grant of Saṁ. 310 (*Ind. Ant.* 6, 12).
(*c*) Lunsadi grant of Saṁ. 352 (ibid. 11, 305).
(*d*) Devali grant of Saṁ. 375 (*WZKM.* 1, 253).
(*e*) Gopanath grant (*Ind. Ant.* 13, 148).

14 They are of Saṁ. 347 and 387.

The letters, very boldly and neatly engraved, can be read with ease.

The grant was issued from Valabhī by *paramamāheśvara* Śrī-Dhruvasena, also called Bālāditya. He does not bear any royal epithet in any of his grants. The panegyrical introduction, including the description of each one of his predecessors, is precisely like that in his grant of Saṁvat 310, published in *Ind. Ant.* 6, 12.

The grant is dated the 14th day of the bright half of Śrāvaṇa of Saṁ. 313. The earliest grant found of the king is the one mentioned already (of Saṁ. 310) and the latest of Saṁ. 321 ; see *Ep. Ind.* 8, 194. Two more grants of the same king, both of Saṁ. 320, were published in *JBBRAS.* 20, 6 and in *Ep. Ind.* 8, 188. One more grant of his dated Saṁ. 312 is yet unpublished.

The grantees in the present case are two Brahmans of the Kapiṣṭhala[15] *gotra* and followers of the Sāmaveda. They had migrated from Velāpadra and had settled in Gorakeśa. One of the Brahmans was named Devakula and was the son of the Brahman Śarmman ; the other, the nephew[16] of the former, was named Bhāda and was the son of Brahman Dattila.

The property granted to them is described thus :—

(1) A field consisting of three pieces and measuring 100 pādāvarttas (of land) in the village called Bahumūla situated in the Vaṭapallikā district in Surāṣṭra. In the south-west quarter (of the village) lies the first piece, of which the boundaries are: to the east Āmragarttā, to the south also Āmragarttā, to the west the field of the Saṅgha,[17] (and) to the north of the

---

15 For the use of this word in the sense of *gotra*, see the Siddhānta-kaumudī, VIII. 3. 91.

16 It is not quite clear whether the latter Brahman Bhāda was the nephew (भ्रातृव्य) of Devakula or of his father Śarmman. In the former case the two grantees stand in the relation of uncle and nephew and in the latter case of cousins.

17 This may be the monastery of Mimmā for which a grant in the same village was made sixty five years back. See the grant of Saṁ. 248, *Ind. Ant.* 5, 206.

field of Devī. In its western quarter lies the second piece whose boundries are : to the east the field given as a brahmadeya[18] to Kumārabhoga, to the south the boundary of (the village) Gorakeśa, to the west also the boundary of Gorakeśa, (and) to the north the field of Buṭṭaka. Similarly in the same western quarter lies the third piece whose boundaries are : to the east the Gorakṣita[19] field, to the south the brahmadeya field of Sthaviraka, to the west the brahmadeya field of Ṣaṣṭhīśūra, (and) to the north the field of the Kuṭumbi Kuhuṇḍaka.

(2) Also in this very village called Bahumūla in its western quarter a second (field of) 100 pādāvarttas and consisting of three pieces. The boundaries of the first piece are : to the east the field of the Brahman Bhāva, to the south the field of the Saṅgha, to the west the brahmadeya field of Sthavira, (and) to the north the field of Kuṭumbi Kuhuṇḍaka. The boundaries of the second piece are : to the east the brahmadeya field of Sthavira, to the south the brahmadeya field of Kumārabhoga, to the west the brahmadeya field of Ṇaṇṇa, (and) to the north the brahmadeya field of Ṣaṣṭhīśūra. The boundaries of the third piece are : to the east the field of Saṅgha, to the south the boundary of Gorakeśa, to the west also the boundary of Gorakeśa, (and) to the north the brahmadeya field of Kumārabhoga.

The Dūtaka or executive officer of this grant is Sāmanta Sīlāditya. He seems to belong to the royal family. In the grant of Saṁ. 310 the same man is Dūtaka. But in other grants of Dhruvasena the Dūtaka is Rājaputra Kharagraha.

The grant was drafted by the Chief Secretary (Divirapati) Vattrabhaṭṭi, who was also the minister for peace and war (*san-*

---

18 A brahmadeya grant is accompanied with some special privileges which are not given in an ordinary grant.

19 A pasture land meant for the cattle to graze in. Cf. the Marathi word गायरान.

dhivigrahādhikṛta). He was also the writer of the grant of Saṁ. 310.

As regards the localities mentioned in the grant, Velāpadra cannot be exactly identified. It is, however, mentioned in two more grants of Saṁ. 210 and 252.[20] In the latter it is said to be in the Jhari District (sthalī). Jhari can be identified with the modern Jhar in the Amarelī District in Kathiavad. Gorakeśa is no doubt the modern village Goras in the Mahuva District in the Bhavnagar State, where the present plates were discovered. The village Bahumūla situated in the Vaṭapallikā-sthalī is also mentioned in the grant of Saṁ. 248,[21] but it cannot be identified.

TEXT[1].

First plate.

1 ओं[2] स्वस्ति **वलभीतः** प्रसभप्रणतामित्राणां मैत्रकाणां[3]मतुलबलसम्प[4]न्न-
मण्डलाभोगसंसक्तप्रहारशतलब्धप्रताप-

2 प्रतापोपनतदानमानार्ज्जवोपार्ज्जितानुरागादनरक्तमौ[5]लभृतश्रेणीबलावाप्त-
राज्यश्रीय:[6] **परममाहेश्वरश्रीभटार्का-**

3 दव्यवच्छिन्नराजवङ्गा[7]न्मातापितृचरणारविन्दप्रणतिप्रविधौताशेषकल्मषः शैश-
वात्प्रभृतिखड्गद्वितीयबाहुरेव सम-

4 दपरगजघटास्फोटनप्रकाशितसत्वनिकषः तत्प्रभावप्रणतारातिचूदा[8]रत्नप्रभा-
संसक्तपादनखरश्मिसङ्हतिः सक-

5 लस्मृतिप्रणीतमार्ग्गसम्यक्परिपालनप्रजाहृदयरञ्जनान्वर्त्थराजशब्दः रूप-
कान्तिस्थैर्य्यगाम्भीर्य्यबुद्धिसम्पद्भिः स्मरशशा-

6 [9]ङ्काद्रराजोदधित्रिदशगुरुधनेशानतिशयानः शरणागताभयप्रदानपरतया
त्रि[10]णवदपास्ताशेषस्वकार्य्यफल[11] प्रार्त्थना-

7 धिकार्त्थप्रदानानन्दितविद्वत्सुहृत्प्रणयिहृदयः पादचारीव सकलभुवनमण्डला-
भोगप्रमोदः **परममाहेश्वरः श्रीगुह-**

[1] From the original copper-plates.—[2] Expressed by a symbol.—[3] Read मैत्रकाणामतुल.—[4] In earlier grants the word is सपत्न. See *Ep. Ind.* 3, 319.—[5] For the meaning of these words see *Ind. Ant.* 48,207.—[6] Read श्रियः.—[7] Read वंशान्माता.—[8] Read चूडा.—[9] Read शशाङ्काद्रिराजो.—[10] Read तृण.—[11] Read फलः.

[20] See *Ep. Ind.* 15, pp. 255 and 187 respectively.

[21] See *Ind. Ant.* 5, 206.

8 **सेन**स्तस्य सुतस्तत्पादनखमयूखसन्तानविसृतजाह्नवीजलौघप्रक्षालिताशेष-
कल्मषः प्रणयिशतसहस्रोपजीव्यमान-

9 सम्पद्रूपलोभादिवाश्रितः सरभसमाभिगामिकैर्गुणैस्सहजशक्तिशिक्षाविशेष-
विस्मापिताखिलधनुर्द्धरः प्रथमनरपति-

10 समतिसृष्टानामनुपालयिता धर्म्मदायानां अपाकर्त्ता प्रजोपघातकारिणामुपप्ल-
वानां दर्शयिता श्रीसरस्वत्योरेकाधिवा-

11 सस्य[12] सङ्हतारातिपक्षलक्ष्मीपरिभोगदक्षविक्रमो:[13] विक्रमोपसंप्राप्तवि-
मलपार्थिवश्रीः **परममाहेश्विरः**[14] **श्रीधरसेनः**

12 तस्य सुतः तत्पादानुध्यातः सकलजगदानन्दनात्यद्भुतगुणसमुदयस्थगितस-
मग्रदिङ्मण्डलः समरशतविजया[15]शोभा-

13 सनाथमण्डलाग्रद्यू[16]तिभासुरतरान्स[17]पीठोदूढगुरु[18]मनोरथमहाभारः सर्व्व-
विद्यापरापरविभागाधिगमविमलमतिर-

14 पि सर्व्वतः सुभाषितलवेनापि सुखोपपादनीयपरितोषः समग्रलोकागाध-
गाम्भीर्य्यहृदयोपि सुचरितातिशयसुव्यक्तपरम-

15 कल्याणस्वभावः [19]खीलीभूतकृतयुगनृपतिपथविशोधनाधिगतोदग्रकीर्तिः
धर्म्मानुपरोधोज्ज्वलतरीकृतार्त्थसुखसम्पदुपसेवा-

16 निरूढ**धर्म्मादित्य**द्वितीयनामा **परममाहेश्वरः श्रीशिलादित्यः**
तस्यानुजस्तत्पादानुद्ध्यातः स्वयमुपेन्द्रगुरुणेव गुरुणात्या-

17 दरवता समभिलषनी[20]यामपि राजलक्ष्मीस्कन्धासक्तां परमभद्र इव धुर्य्यः
तदाज्ञासम्पादनैकरसतयैवोद्वहनखेदसुख-

18 रतिभ्यामनायासितसत्वसम्पत्तिः प्रभावसम्पद्वशीकृतनृपतिशतशिरोरत्नच्छा-
योपगूढपादपीठोपि परावज्ञाभिमान-

19 रसानालिङ्गितमनोवृत्तिः प्रणतिमेकां परित्यज्य प्रख्यातपौरुषाभिमानैरप्यराति-
भिरनासादितप्रतिक्रियोपायः कृतनिखि-

20 लभुवनामोदविमलगुणसङ्हति[21] प्रसभविघटितसकलकली[22]विलसितगतिः
नीचजनाधिरोहिभिरशेषैद्दो[23]षैरनामृष्टात्यु-

21 न्नतहृदयः प्रख्यातपौरुषास्त्रकौशलातिशयगणातिथविपक्षक्षितिपतिलक्ष्मी-
[24]स्वयग्रहप्रकाशितप्रवीरपुरुषप्रथमसख्या-[25]

[12] Read संहता.—[13] Read विक्रमो.—[14] Read माहेश्वरः.—[15] Read विजय.—
[16] Read द्युति.—[17] Read तरांस.—[18] Read गुरु.—[19] Read खिलीभूत.—[20] Read
लषणीया.—[21] Read संहतिः.—[22] Read कलि.—[23] Read शेषैर्दोषै.—[24] Read
स्वयं.—[25] Read संख्या.

22 धिगमः **परममाहेश्वरः श्रीखरग्रहः** तस्य तनयः तत्पादानुध्यातः
सकलविद्याधिगमविहितनिखिलविद्वज्जनमनःपरितोषातिशयः
23 सत्वसम्पदा त्यागौडार्य्येण[26] च विगतानू[27]संधानाशमाहितारातिपक्षमनो-
रथाक्षभङ्गः सम्यगुपलक्षितानेकशास्त्र-
24 कलालोकचरितगह्वरविभागोपि परमभद्रप्रकृतिः अकृत्रिमप्रश्रयविनयशोभा-
विभूषणः समरशतजयपताका-

Second plate.

25 हरणप्रत्यलो[28]दग्रबाहुदण्डविध्वन्सि[29]तनिखिलप्रतिपक्षदर्प्पोदयः स्वधनुः
प्रभावपरिभूतास्त्रकौशलाभिमानसकलनृपतिमण्ड-
26 लाभिनन्दितशासनः **परममंहेश्वरः**[30] [31]**श्रिधरसेन.** तस्यानुजः
तत्पादानुध्यातः सच्चरितातिशयितसकलपूर्व्वनरपतिरतिदु-
27 स्साधा[32]ना[ना*]मपि प्रसाधयिता विषयाणां मूर्त्तिमानिव पुरुषकारः
परिवृद्धगुणानुरागनिर्भरचित्तवृत्तिभिर्म्मनुरिव स्वय-
28 मभ्युपपन्नः प्रकृतिभिः अधिगतकलाकलापः कान्तिमान्निर्व्रि[33]तिहेतुरकलङ्क
ऽकुमुदनाथः प्राज्यप्रतापस्थगितदिगन्तराल[34]प्रध्वान्सि-[35]
29 तध्वान्तराशिः सततोदितस्सविता प्रकृतिभ्यः परं प्रत्ययमर्त्थवन्तमतिबहु-
तिथप्रयोजनानुबन्धमागमपरिपूर्णं विदधानः सन्धिविग्र-
30 हसमासनिश्चयनिपुणः स्थानेनुरूपमादेशं ददद्गुणवृद्धिविधानजनितसंस्कार-
स्साधूनां राज्यसा[36]लातुरीयतन्त्रयोरुभयोरपि
31 निष्णातः प्रकृष्टविक्रमोपि करुणामृदुहृदयः श्रुतवानप्यगर्व्वितः कान्तोपि
प्रशमी स्थिरसौहृदय्योपि[37] निरसिता दोषवतां उदय-
32 समयसमुपजनितजनतानुरागपरिपिहितभुवनसमर्त्थितप्रथित**बालादित्य-**
द्वितीयनामा परममाहेश्वरः श्रीध्रुवसेनः कुशली
33 सर्व्वानेव यथा संम्ब[38]द्ध्यमानकान्समाज्ञापयत्यस्तु वस्संविदितं यथा मया
मातापित्रोः पुण्याप्यायनाय [39]**वलापद्र**विनिर्ग्गत**गोरकेश**नि-
वासिकपि-

[26] Read त्यागौदार्येण.—[27] Read तानुसंधानसमा.—[28] Read प्रत्ययो.—[29] Read विध्वंसित.—[30] The stroke meant for *ā* is through mistake placed right above the letter म. Read माहेश्वरः.—[31] Read श्री.—[32] Read दुस्साधना.—[33] Read निर्वृति.—[34] Read राल.—[35] Read ध्वंसि.—[36] Read शाला.—[37] Read हृदयोपि.—[38] Read सम्बध्य.—[39] The proper reading of this word must be वेलापद्र as the place is mentioned in some other plates; compare *Ep. Ind.* 14, 255 and *Ind. Ant.* 14, 187.

34 छलसगोत्रछन्दोगसब्रह्मचारिब्राह्मणशर्म्मपुत्रब्राह्मण**देवकुल**तथैतद्भ्रातृव्य-
ब्राह्मणदत्तिलपुत्रब्राह्मण**भादाभ्यां** **सुराष्ट्रेषु वटपल्लिका-
स्थल्या**-[40]

35 **न्तर्ग्गतबहुम्**[41]**लग्रामे** त्रिखण्डावस्थितपादावर्त्तशतपरिमाणं क्षेत्रं यत्र
दक्षिणापरसीम्नि प्रथमखण्डं यस्य आघाटनानि पूर्व्वतः आम्रगर्त्ता
दक्षिणत आम्रग-

36 र्त्ता च अपरतः सङ्घक्षेत्रं उत्तरतः देवीक्षेत्रं तथापरसीम्नी[42] द्वितीय-
खण्डं यस्याघाटनानि पूर्व्वतः कुमारभोगब्रह्मदेयक्षेत्रं दक्ष[43]-
णतः गोरकेशसीमा

37 अपरतः गोरकेशसि[44]मैव उत्तरतः बुद्धकक्षेत्रं तथापरसीम्न्यैव तृतीय-
खण्डं यस्या[45] आघाटनानि पूर्व्वतः गोरविषतक्षेत्रं दक्षिणतः
स्थविरकब्र-

38 ह्मदेयक्षेत्रं अपरतः षष्ठिशुर[46]ब्रह्मदेयक्षेत्रं उत्तरतः कुटुम्बिकुहुण्डक-
क्षेत्रं तथास्मिन्नेव बहुमूलग्रामे अपरसीम्नि द्वितीयत्रिखण्डाव-
स्थितपा-

39 दावर्त्तशतं यत्र प्रथमखण्डस्याघटननि[47] पूर्व्वतः ब्राह्मणभावक्षेत्रं
दक्षिणतः सङ्घक्षेत्रं अपरतः स्थविरब्रह्मदेयक्षेत्र[48] उत्तरतः
कुटुम्बिकुहुण्डकक्षेत्रं

40 तथा द्वितीयखण्डस्याघाटनानि पूर्व्वतः स्थविरकब्रह्मदेयक्षेत्रं दक्षिणतः
कुम(मा)रभोगब्रह्मदेयक्षेत्रंञ्च[49] अपरतः णण्णब्रह्मदेयक्षेत्रं
उत्तरतः षष्ठिशू-

41 रब्रह्मदेयक्षेत्रं तथा[50] त्रितीयखण्डस्याघ[51]टनानि पूर्व्वतः सङ्घक्षेत्रं दक्ष-[52]
णतः गोरकेशसीमा अपरतः गोरकेशसीमैवः[53] उत्तरतः
कुमारभोगब्रह्म-

42 देयक्षेत्रं एवमेतदुपरिलिखितषट्खण्डावस्थितं भूपादावर्त्तशतद्वयं सोद्रङ्गं
सोपरिकरं सभूतवातप्रत्यायं[54] सधान्यहिरण्यादेयं सदशापरा-

43 धं सोत्पद्यमानविष्टिकं सर्व्वराजकीयानामहस्तप्रक्षेपणीयं पूर्व्वप्रत्तदेवब्रह्म-
देयवर्ज्जं भूमिच्छिद्रन्य[55]येनाचन्द्रार्क्कार्ण्णवक्षितिसरित्पर्व्वत-

[40] Read स्थल्यन्त.—[41] This village name is also found in another grant (*Ind. Ant.* 4, 174) as बहुमूल which seems to be the correct reading.—[42] Read सीम्नि.—[43] Read दक्षिणतः.—[44] Read सीमैव.—[45] Read यस्य.—[46] Read शूर.—[47] Read स्याघाटनानि.—[48] Read क्षेत्रं.—[49] Read क्षेत्रं च.—[50] Read तृतीय.—[51] Read स्याघाटनानि.—[52] Read दक्षिणतः.—[53] Read सीमैव.—[54] Read प्रत्यायं.—[55] Read न्यायेना.

44 समकालीनं पुत्रपौत्रान्वयभोग्यं उदकातिसर्गेण धर्म्मदायो निसृष्टः यतो-
नयोः उचितयो[56] ब्रह्मदेयस्थित्या भुञ्जातः[57] कृषतः कर्षयतोः[58]

45 प्रदिशतोर्व्वा न कैश्चिद्व्यासेधे[59] वर्त्तितव्यमागामिभद्रनृपतिभिरप्यस्मद्वंश[60]
जैरन्यैर्व्वा अनित्यान्यैश्वर्य्याण्यस्थिरं मानुष्यं सामान्यञ्च भूमि-

46 दानफलमवगच्छद्भिरयमस्मद्दायोनुमन्तव्यः परिपालयितव्यश्चेत्युक्तं च ॥
बहुभिर्व्वसुधा भुक्ता राजभिस्सगरादिभिः [।*] यस्य यस्य

47 यदा भूमिस्तस्य तस्य तदा फलं ॥ यानीह दारिद्रयभयान्नरेन्द्रैर्द्धनानि धर्म्मा-
यतनीकृतानि । निर्भुक्तमाल्यप्रतिमानि तानि को नाम

48 साधुः पुनराददित[61] ॥ षष्ठं[62]वर्षसहस्राणि स्वर्गे[63] तिष्ठाति भूमिदः[।*]
आच्छेत्ता चानुमन्ता च तान्येव नरके वसेत ॥ दूतकोत्र ।[64]

49 **सामन्तशीलादित्यः** [।*] लिखितमिदं सन्धिविग्रहाधिकृतदिवि-
र्पतिवत्रभट्टिना[65] । सं ३०० १० ३ श्रावण शु १० ४
[।*] स्वहस्तो मम ऽऽऽ

[56] Read यतोनया उचितया.—[57] Read भुञ्जतः.—[58] Read कर्षयतः.—[59] Read द्व्यासेधे.—[60] Read वंश.—[61] Read ददीत.—[62] Read षष्टिं.—[63] Read तिष्ठति.—[64] This sign of punctuation is unnecessary.—[65] Drop the *repha* on *pa*.

No. XVIII.—A Grant of Siladitya III [Gupta-]Samvat 356.

The two plates making this grant of Śīlāditya III of Saṁ. 356, which form the basis of this article, were found preserved in different places, the first one in the Watson Museum at Rajkot, and the second one in the Barton Museum at Bhavnagar. From their measurements, the distance between the holes meant for the copper rings, from their letters and from the concluding portion of the first plate and the commencing portion of the second plate I find that both these plates are of the same grant.[10]

About the first plate the only information available is that it has been preserved in the Rajkot Museum for the last 28 years, since the time of its foundation and that it was included in the collection of the late Col. Watson, which was purchased for the

[10] I may point out that a first plate lying in the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay, and a second plate lying in the Watson Museum, Rajkot, together make up a complete grant of Saṁ. 210. Unfortunately they have not been published together. The first half was published by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar in *Ep. Ind.* 17, 109; the second half will be published by me in a subsequent issue of the same Journal.

Watson Museum. Nothing is known as to how the second plate came into the possession of the Barton Museum. The first plate is in a bad state of preservation. It is very thin and brittle and contains some large and small holes on its face. The letters are also defaced, but they can almost all be read. The second plate is in a better state of preservation. It has suffered at its rims, destroying a letter or two in each line. A hard deposit of rust has made some letters in the right hand side difficult to be deciphered. The portion of the last line has grown very brittle. Fortunately the date is intact.

Each of the plates measures 18″×12¼″. The engraving of the letters, as seen from the second plate, which is in a better state of preservation, is fairly well executed. But the inscription is full of spelling mistakes, such as the omission and the misuse of the short and long vowels.

The grant was issued by Śīlāditya III. The introductory description of him and his predecessors is practically the same as in other grants of his from Vaḷā (Nos. X and XI above).

The grantee was the Buddhist monastery built by Ācārya Bhikṣu Vimalagupta, of the village Kukkurāṇaka, in the outskirt of Ḍuḍḍā-vihāra in Valabhī. It may be remarked that the Bhikṣu Vimalagupta and the village he belonged to are both mentioned in another grant of Saṁ. 413 published above.

The property granted to the vihāra consisted of a village called Kasaka, which is said to have been situated in (the province of) Surāṣṭra. The portion of the plate containing the name of the district (sthalī) in which it was included has suffered severely.

The purpose for which the grant was made is the usual one with the Buddhist grants, viz. to provide for the worship of Buddhas, and to meet the necessary expenses of the inmates of the monastery.

The Dūtaka who executed this grant was the prince Kharagraha and the writer was divirapati Aṇahila, son of the divirapati Skandabhaṭa, the minister for peace and war. The names of both these officials are found in other grants of the king.

The date of the present grant, Saṁ. 356, is new, and is one of the latest dates found of the king.

TEXT.

First plate.

1 ओं स्वस्ति विजयस्कन्धावारात् **पिच्छि[पंजि]**(?)वासकात् प्रसभप्रणतामित्राणां मैत्रकाणामतुलबलसंपन्नमण्डलाभोगसंसक्तप्रहारशतलब्धप्रतापं[1]प्रता-

2 पोपनतदानमानार्ज्जवोपार्जितानुरागादनुरक्तमौलभृत[2]:श्रेणीबलावाप्तराज्यश्रियः परममाहेश्वरश्री**भटार्क्का**दव्यवच्छिन्नराजवङ्श[3]न्मातापित्रि[4]च-

3 रणारविन्दप्रणतिप्रविधौताशेषकल्मषः शैशवात्प्रभृति खड्गद्वित्ती[5]यबाहुरेव समदपरगजघटास्फोटनप्रकाशितसत्त्वनिकषस्तत्प्रभावप्र-

4 णताराातिचूडारत्नप्रभासंसक्तपादनखरश्मिसंहतिस्सकलस्मृतिप्रणीतमार्ग्गसम्यक्परिपालनप्रजाहृदयरञ्जनादन्वर्त्थराजशब्दो [6]रुप-

5 कान्तिस्थैर्य्य[7]गाम्भीर्य्यबुद्धिसंपाद्भिः स्मरशशाङ्काद्रिराजोदधित्रिदशगुरुधनेशानतिशयानः शरणागताभयप्रदानपरतया [8]त्रिणवदपास्ताशे-

6 [9]शस्वकार्य्यफल[10]प्रार्थनाधिकार्थप्रदानानन्दितविद्वत्सुहृत्प्रणयिहृदयः पादचारीव सकलभुवनमण्डलाभोगप्रमोदः परममाहे-

7 श्वरः श्री**गुहसेन**स्तस्य सुतस्तत्पादनखमयूखसंतानविसृतजाह्नवीजलौघप्रक्षालिताशेषकल्मषः प्रणयिशतसहस्रो[पर्जा]व्यमान-

8 संपद्रूपलोभादिवाश्रितः सरभसम[11]भिगामिकैर्ग्गुणैस्सहजशक्तिशिक्षाविशेषविस्मापिताखिलधनुर्द्धरः प्रथमनरपति[समतिसृ]ष्टाना-

9 मनुपालयिता धर्म्मदायानामपाकर्त्ता प्रजोपघातकारिणामुपप्लवानां दर्शयिता श्रीसरस्वत्योरेकाधिवासस्य संहताराातिपक्षलक्ष्मीप-

10 रिभोगदक्षविक्रमो विक्रमोपसंप्राप्तविमलपार्त्थिवश्रीः परममाहेश्वर[12] श्री**धरसेन**स्तस्यं सुतस्तत्पादानुध्यातःस्स[13]कलजगदानन्दनात्य-

11 द्भुतगुणसमुदयस्थगितसमग्रदिङ्मण्डलः[14] समरशतविजयशोभासनाथमण्डलाग्रद्युतिभासुरतरांसपीठोदूढगुरुमनोरथ-

12 महाभारः सर्व्वविद्यापरापरविभागाधिगमविमलमतिरपि सर्व्वतः सुभाषितलवेनापि सुखोपपादनीयपरितोषः समग्रलोका-

[1] Read प्रतापात्.—[2] Read भृत.—[3] Read वंशान्मा.—[4] Read पितृ.—[5] Read द्वितीय.—[6] Read रूप.—[7] In some other plates we find one more word, धैर्य, here.—[8] Read तृण.—[9] Read शेष.—[10] Read फल:.—[11] Read माभि.—[12] Read माहेश्वर:.—[13] Read ध्यातस्सकल.—[14] Read दिग्मण्डल:.

13 गाधगाम्भीर्य्यहृदयो[पि] [15]सुचरतातिशयसुव्यक्तपरमकल्याणस्वभाव
खिलीभूतकृतयुगनृपातिपथविशोधनाधिगतोद[प्रकीर्त्ति]धर्म्मा-

14 नुपरोधो[ज्व] [लतरोकृतार्थ]सुखसंपदुपसेवानिरूढ**धर्म्मादित्य**द्वित[16]यनामा
परममाहेश्वरः श्री**शीलादित्य**स्तस्यानुजस्त[त्पादानुद्धयातः]

15 स्वयमुपे[न्द्र]गुरु[णे]व गुरुणात्यादरवता समभिलषणीयामपि रा[ज]लक्ष्मी
स्कन्धासक्तां परमभद्र इव धुर्य्यस्तदाज्ञासंपादनैक[र]सत[यै वो]
द्व ह-

16 न्खेदसुखर[तिभ्याम]नायासितसत्वसंपत्तिः प्रभावसंपद्व[शी]कृतनृपतिशत-
शिरोरत्नच्छायोपगूढपादपीठोपि परावज्ञाभिमानरसाना-

17 लिङ्गितमनोवृत्तिः प्रणतिमेकां परित्यज्य प्रख्यातपौरुषाभिमा[नै]रप्यराति-
भिरनासादितप्रतिक्रियोपाय[17] कृतनिखिलभुवनामोदविमलगु-

18 णसंहति[18] प्रसभविघटितसकलकलिविलसितगतिः [19]निचजनाधिरोहिभि-
रशेषैर्द्दोषैरनामृष्टात्युन्नतहृदयः प्रख्यातपौरुषास्त्रकौशलातिश-

19 य[गुण *]गणतिथविपक्षक्षितिपतिलक्ष्मीस्वयंग्रहप्रकाशितप्रवीरपुरुषप्रथमसं-
ख्याधिगमः परममाहेश्वरः श्री**खरग्रह**स्तस्य तनयस्तत्पादानु-
द्धयात[20]

20 सकलविद्याधिगमविहितनिखिलविद्वज्जनमन[21]परितोषातिशय[22]सत्वसंपदा त्या-
गौदार्य्येणविगतानुसन्धानासम[23]हितारातिपक्षमनोरथाक्षभङ्गः सम्य-

21 गुपलक्षितानेकशास्त्रकलालोकचरितगह्वरविभागोपि परमभद्रप्रकृतिरकृत्रिमप्र-
श्रयविनयशोभाविभूषणः समरशतजयपताकाहरणप्र-

22 त्यलोदग्रबाहुदण्डविध्वान्सि[24]तनिखिलप्रतिपक्षदर्प्पोदयः स्वधनु[25]प्रभावपरि-
भूतास्त्रकौशलाभिमानसकलनृपतिमण्डलाभिनन्दितशासनः परम-
माहेश्वरः

23 श्री**धरसेनं**स्तस्यानुजस्तत्पादानुद्धयात[26]सच्चरितातिशयितसकलपूर्व्वनरपति[27]
अतिदुस्साधा[28]नामपि प्रसाधयिता विषयाणां मूर्त्तिमानिव
पुरुषकार[29] परिवृद्धगुणा-

24 नुरागनिर्भरचित्तवृतिभिर्मनुरिव स्वयमभ्युपपन्नः प्रकृतिभिरधिगतकला-
कलाप X कान्तिमान्निर्वृतिहेतुरकलङ्ककुमुदनाथ[30] [31]प्रज्यप्रतापस्थ-
गितदिगन्तराल[32]प्रध्वन्सि-[33]

[15] Read सुचरिता . . . . . . स्वभावः.—[16] Read द्वितीय.—[17] Read पायः.—[18] Read संहतिः.—[19] Read नीच.—[20] Read नुद्धयातः.—[21] Read मनः.—[22] Read तिशयः.—[23] Read सन्धानसमाहिता.—[24] Read विध्वंसित.—[25] Read धनुः.—[26] Read ध्यातः.—[27] Read पतिः.—[28] Read साधनाना.—[29] Read कारः.—[30] Read नाथः.—[31] Read प्राज्य.—[32] Read दिगन्तरालः.—[33] Read प्रध्वंसित.

25 तध्वान्तराशि[34] सततोदितः सविता प्रकृतिभ्यः परंप्रत्ययं अर्त्थवन्तमति-
बहुतिथप्रयोजनानुबन्धमागमपरिपूर्ण्णं विदधानः सन्धिविग्रहसमा-
सनिश्चयनिपुणः

26 स्थानेनुरुप[35]मादेशं ददद्गुणवृद्धिविधानजनितसंस्कारः साधुना[36] राज्यसालातु-
रि[37] यस्तन्त्रयोरुभयोरपि निष्णात[38]प्रकृष्टविक्रमोपि करुणामृदुहृदयः

27 श्रुतवानप्यगर्व्वित × कान्तोपि प्रशमि[39] स्थिरसौहृदय्योपि निरसित[40] दोषव-
तामुदयः समयसमुपजनितजनतानुरागपरिपिहितभुवनसमर्थित-
प्रथित**बाला**-

28 **दित्य**द्वितियनाम[41] परममाहेश्वर[42] श्री**ध्रुवसेन**स्तस्य सुतस्तत्पादकमलप्रणा-
मधरणिकषणजनितकिणलान्छनललाटचन्द्रशकल[43] शिशुभाव
एव श्रवणनिहित ·

29 मौक्तिकालङ्कारविभ्रमामलश्रुतिविशेष[44] प्रदानसलिलक्षालिताग्रहस्तारविन्द ×
कन्याया इव मृदुकरग्रहणादमन्दिक्रि[45]तानन्द[वि]धिर्व्वसुन्धरायाः

30 कार्मुकधनुर्वेद इव संभावितासेषलक्षकलाप[46] प्रणतसामन्तमण्डलोत्तमाङ्ग-
धृतचूडारत्नोपमानशासन-[47]

31 परममाहेश्वरः परमभट्टारकमहाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वरचक्रवर्त्तिश्री**धरसेनः**

Second plate.

32 [तत्पि]तामहभ्रात्रि[48]श्री**शीलादि**त्यस्य शार्ङ्ग[पाणे]रिवाङ्गजन्मनो भक्ति-
बन्धुरावयवकल्पितप्रणतेरातिधवलया दूरं तत्पादारविन्दप्रवृ[त्तया
नख-]

33 [म]णिरुचा मन्दाकिन्येव नित्यममलितोत्तमाङ्गदेशस्यागस्त्यस्येव राजर्षेर्द्दाक्षि-
ण्यमातन्वानस्य प्रबलधवलिम्ना यशसां वलये[न मण्डित-]

34 ककुभ[49] नभसि यामिनि[50]पतेर्व्विडम्बिताखण्डपरिवेषमण्डलस्य पयोदश्याम-
शिखरचूचुकरुचिरसह्यविन्ध्यस्तनयुगायाः क्षितेः पत्युः श्री**डेरभ**
[**ट्**स्या-]

35 [ङ्ग]जः क्षितिपसंहतेरनुरागिण्याः शुचियशो[51] ङ्कभृत : स्वयंवरमालामिव
राज्यश्रियमर्प्पयन्त्या × कृतपरिग्रहः शौर्य्यमप्रतिहतव्यापारमा-
[नमितप्रच-]

[34] Read राशिः.—[35] Read नुरूप.—[36] Read साधूनां.—[37] Read शालातुरीय.—
[38] Read निष्णातः.—[39] Read प्रशमी.—[40] Read निरसिता.—[41] Read द्वितीयनामा.—
[42] Read माहेश्वरः.—[43] Read शकलः.—[44] Read विशेषः.—[45] Read मन्दीकृता.—
[46] Read शेषलक्ष्यकलापः —[47] Read शासनः.—[48] Read भ्रातृ.—[49] Read ककुभो.—
[50] Read यामिनी.—[51] Read यशोंशुक.

36 [ण्ड]रिपुमण्डलं मण्डलाग्रमिवावलम्बमानः शरदि प्रसभमाकृष्टशिलीमुखबा णासनापादितप्रसाधनानांपरभुवा[52] विधिवदाचरितकरग्रहणः पू-

37 र्व्वमेव विविधवर्ण्णोज्ज्वलेन श्रुतातिशयेनोद्भासितश्रवणा[53] पुनःपुनरुक्तेनेव रत्नालङ्कारेणालङ्कृतश्रोत्र[54] परिस्फुरत्कटककविकटकीटपक्षर[त्नकि रण-]

38 [म] विच्छिन्नप्रदानसलिलनिवहावसेकविलसन्नवशैवलाङ्कुरामवाग्रपाणिमुद्वहन् धृतविशालरत्नवलयजलधिवेलातटायमानभुजप-

39 रिष्वक्तविश्वम्भरः परममाहेश्वरः श्रीध्रुवसेनस्तस्याग्रजोपरमहीपतिस्पर्श- दोपनास[55]नधियेव लक्ष्म्या स्वयमतिस्पष्टचेष्टमाश्लिष्टाङ्ग-

40 [य]ष्टि[र]तिरुचिरतरच[रित]गरिमपरिकलितसकलनरपतिरतिप्रकृष्टानुरागरस- रभसवशीकृतप्रणतसमस्तसामन्तचक्रचूडामणिमयूख-

41 [ख]चितचरणकमलयुगलः प्रोद्दामोदारदोर्द्दण्डदलितद्विषद्वर्ग्गदर्प्पः प्रसर्प्प- त्पटीयः प्रतापप्लोशि[षि]ताशेषशत्रुवङ्श[56]प्रणयिपक्ष-

42 [नि]क्षिप्तलक्ष्मीकः प्रेरितगदोत्क्षिप्तसुदर्शनचक्रः परिहृतबालक्रीडोनध × कृतद्विजातिरेकविक्रमप्रसाधितधरित्रीतलोनङ्गीकृतजलशय्योपूर्व्व-

43 पुरुषोत्तमः साक्षाद्धर्म्म इव सम्यग्व्यवस्थापितवर्ण्णाश्रमाचारः पूर्व्वैरप्यूर्व्वीप- तिभिस्त्रि[57]ष्णालवलुब्धैर्य्यान्यपहृतानि देवब्रह्मदेया-

44 नि तेषामप्यतिसरलमनः प्रसरमुत्सङ्कलनानुमोदनाभ्यां परिमुदितत्रिभुव- नाभिनन्दितोच्छ्रितोत्कृष्टधवलधर्म्मध्वजप्रकाशितनिजवङ्शो[58] दे-

45 [व]द्विजगुरून्प्रति [59]यथर्हमनवरतप्रवर्तितमहोद्रङ्गादिदानव्यसनानुपजातस- न्तोषोपात्तोदारकीर्त्ति[60] पक्ति[61]परंपरादन्तुरितनिखिलदिक्च-

46 [क्रवालः] स्पष्टमेव यथार्त्थं **धर्म्मादित्या**परनामा परममाहेश्वरः श्रीखर- **ग्रह**स्तस्याग्रजन्मन × कुमुदषण्डश्रीविकासिन्या कलावतश्चन्द्रिक-

47 [येव की]र्त्या धवलितसकलदिग्मण्डलस्य खण्डितागुरुविलेपनपिण्डश्यामल- विन्ध्यशैलविपुलपयोधराभोगायाः क्षोण्याः पत्यु[62] श्री**शीला-**

48 [**दित्य**]स्य सूनुर्न्नवप्रालेयकिरण इव प्रतिदिनसंवर्द्धमानकलाचक्रवाल × केसरि[63]न्द्रशिशुरिव राजलक्ष्मीमचलवनस्थलीमिवा-

49 [ल]ङ्कुर्व्वाण[64] शिखण्डिकेतक[65] इव रुचिमच्चूडामण्डन[66] प्रचण्डशक्ति- प्रभावश्च शरदागम इव प्रतापवानुल्लसत्पद्मः संयुगे विदलय-

52 Read भुवां.—53 Read श्रवणः.—54 Read श्रोत्रः.—55 Read नाश.—56 Read वंश.—57 Read तृष्णा.—58 Read वंशो.—59 Read यथा.—60 Read कीर्त्तिः.—61 Read पङ्क्ति.—62 Read पत्युः.—63 Read केसरीन्द्र.—64 Read कुर्व्वाणः.—65 Read केतन.—66 Read मण्डनः.

50 [न्नम्भोधरा]निव परगजानुदय एव तपनबालातप इव संग्रामे मुष्णन्नभिमुखाना-
मायून्सि[67] द्विषतां पर[म*]माहेश्वरः श्रीशी[लादित्यः]

51 [सर्व्वाने]व समाज्ञापयत्यस्तु वस्संविदितं यथा मया मातापित्रोऽपुण्याप्यायनाय
श्रीवलभ्यां [अभ्यन्त]रिकापूर्व्वनिविष्टडुड्डाविहार- . . .

52 . . परिकल्पित [?] कुकुराणक [?] [68]ग्रामनिविष्टाचार्य्यभिक्षुविमल-
गुप्तकारितविहारे चतुर्दिशाभ्यागतार्य्यभिक्षुसंघाय शयनासनग्लान-
भैषज्यचीवरिकापिण्ड . . . .

53 . . . . मेतत्परिबद्धपादमूलप्रजीवनाय विहारस्य खण्डस्फुटितप्रति-
संस्कारणाय गन्धकुटी च भगवतां बुद्धानां पूजास्नपनगन्धधूप-
पुष्पादिपरिचर्य्यार्थं सुरा[ष्ट्रेषु] . .

54 [डुम.निका]मण्डलीस्थल्यां कसकग्रामः सोद्रङ्गः सोपरिकरः सभू-
तवातप्रत्यायः सधान्यहिरण्यादेयः सदशापराधः सोत्पद्यमान-

55 विष्टिक[69] सर्व्वराजकीयानामहस्तप्रक्षेपणीयः पूर्व्वप्रत्तदेवब्रह्मदेयरहितो
भूमिच्छिद्रन्यायेनाचन्द्रार्क्कार्ण्णवक्षितिसरित्प-

56 र्व्वतसमकालीनं उदकातिसर्ग्गेण धर्म्मदायो निसृष्टः [।*] यतोस्य डुड्डावि-
हार आर्य्यभिक्षुसंघस्योपरिलिखितक्रमेण विनियोग . . .
न कैश्चिद्व्या-

57 संघे वर्त्तितव्य[मागामिभद्रनृपतिभि]श्च[70]स्मद्वङ्श[71]जैरन्यैर्व्वा अनित्यान्यैश्व-
र्य्याण्यस्थिरं मानुष्यं सामान्यंञ्च[72] भूमिदानफलमवगच्छद्भिरयम-

58 स्मद्दायोनुमन्तव्यः पालयितव्यश्चेत्युक्तंञ्च[73]बहुभिर्व्वसुधा भुक्ता राजभि-
स्सगरादिभि[74]यस्य यस्य यदा भूमिस्तस्य तस्य तदा फलं॥
यानीह दारि-

59 द्र्यभयान्नरेन्द्रै[र्धनानि धर्मायतनीकृतानि नि]र्भुक्तमाल्यप्रतिमानि तानि को
नाम साधुःपुन[राददीत] [॥*] [ष]ष्टिं[75] व[र्षसह]स्रा[णि]

60 स्वर्ग्गे तिष्ठति भूमिद[76] आच्छेत्ता चानु[म]न्ता च तान्येव नरके वसेत् ॥
दू[तको]त्र [राज]पुत्रखरग्रहः

61 लिखितमिदं सन्धिविग्रहाधिकृतदिविरपतिश्रीस्कन्दभटपुत्रदिविरप[तिश्रीम-
द]नहिलेनेति॥ स २०० ५० ६ ज्येष्ठ [७ ?] स्वहस्तो
[मम]

[67] Read मायूंषि.—[68] The first कु is here doubled by mistake.—[69] Read विष्टिकः.—[70] Read श्चा.—[71] Read वंश.—[72] Read सामान्यं च.—[73] Read त्युक्तं च.—[74] Read दिभिः.—[75] Read षष्टिं.—[67] Read भूमिदः.

INDEX A.

List of the Copper-Plates according to Kings.

King.	Date.	Serial No. of the inscription.
Dhruvasena I	226	I
Do.	..	II
Do.	..	III
Dharasena II	..	IV
Do.	..	V
Śīlāditya I	286	VI
Do.	287	VII
Do.	..	VIII
Dhruvasena II	313	XVII
Dhruvasena III	..	IX
Śīlāditya III	343	X
Do.	356	XVIII
Do.	..	XI
Unassignable plates	..	XII–XVI

INDEX B.

Places mentioned in the Grants.

(The numbers denote the serial number of the inscriptions.)

November, 1923.

NOTES ON SOME UNPUBLISHED VALABHĪ COPPER-PLATES BELONGING TO THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY AND LENT TO THE PRINCE OF WALES MUSEUM OF WESTERN INDIA

By G. V. Acharya

Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay

No. I.—Plates of Dhruvasena I, dated [Gupta-] Samvat 210

The plates, two in number, are inscribed on one side only, and each measures $10\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. The seal shows the usual squatting bull in the upper half of the surface; in the lower half there are the words *Śrī-Bhaṭaka.* Each plate contains 14 lines of writing and the date given in line 27 furnishes instances of the numerical symbols for 200, 10 and 3.

These plates have a close resemblance, from the beginning to the end, with the first (dated G.S. 206) of the five Valabhī plates edited by Prof. Sten Konow and published in the *Epigraphia Indica,* vol. 11, p. 104 ff. Here the messenger is, however, Rudradhara, who is known to us from the Pālitānā plates of Dhruvasena, dated 210 G. S.

The grant is issued from the city of Valabhī (Vaḷā in Kathiawad); the donor is Dhruvasena [I] of the Maitraka dynasty. The donee is recorded as the Ṛgvedin Brāhmaṇa Guhabhaṭṭi of the Bhārggava-gotra, resident of Hastavapra (Hāthab, six miles south of Gogbā under Bhavnagar). The object of the grant is 200 pādāvarttas of land on the south-east border of the village Bhadreṇikā and at its junction with the border of the village Naṭṭakaputra.

The date of the record is the 10th of Bhādrapada of the year 210 [of the Gupta-Valabhī era], which corresponds to A.D. 530.

An Extract from the Text[1]

Plate I

14 मानकननु[2]दर्शयत्यस्तु वो विदितं यथा हस्तवप्राहरण्या[3]

Plate II

15 भद्रेणिकाग्रामपूर्व्वदक्षिणसीम्नि नट्टकपुत्रग्रामसीमसन्धौ पादा-

16 वर्त्तशतद्वयं सभूतवत[4]सहिरण्यादेयं हस्तवप्रवास्तव्यब्राह्मणभट्टिगुहभट्टिभ्य:

17 भार्ग्गवसगोत्राभ्य: बह्वृजसब्रह्मचारिभ्य: मया मातापित्रो: पुण्याप्यायन[5]-
यात्म-

. . . .

20 उदकातिसर्ग्गेण ब्रह्मदायो निसृष्ट: . . . . .

. . . .

27 शुष्ककोटरवासिन: कृष्णाहयोहि जायन्ते ब्रह्मदेयं हरन्ति ये सं २००
१० भाद्रपद ब १३

28 स्वहस्तो मम मह[6]सामन्तमहाराजध्रुवसेनस्य दूत*: रुद्रधर: लिखितं
किक्ककेन

[1] From the original plates.—For the contents of the first 13 lines, cf. *Ep. Ind.* 11, 104.—[2] Read °काननु.—[3] Read °हरण्यां.—[4] Read °वात.—[5] Read °नायात्म.—6 Read महा°.

No. II.—Plates of Dharasena II, dated [Gupta-] Samvat 270

In the collection of copper-plates lent by this Society to the Prince of Wales Museum of Western India, there are 4 pieces of plates, all marked No. 73, which is evidently the number of the Society's list. The biggest of these is the second plate of this grant, with the two corners towards the end corroded and lost. The piece next in size contains the middle portion of the first plate (lines 1-15) and in it only the usual genealogical part is left intact. The sides at both ends are missing. Of the remaining two, one piece measuring $9\frac{3}{4}'' \times 2\frac{1}{2}''$ is the top portion of the second plate of some other grant, and has no connection whatever with this grant. The last piece measuring approximately $10'' \times 4\frac{3}{4}''$ appears to be the broken piece of the first plate of a Valabhī grant

but has also no connection with this grant. These two latter pieces will thus have to wait till their parentage is traced.

The piece forming the first plate measures 5½″×5½″, the second 12½″×8½″. Both of them are inscribed on one side only. Fifteen lines of writing have been preserved on Plate I, and 17 on Plate II. The date is given in the last line of Plate II and it furnishes instances of the numerical symbols for 200, 70 and 10.

The genealogical portion in the first plate is exactly the same as that given in another grant dated 270 G.S., published in *Ind. Ant.* 7, 70. The second line of the second plate gives the name of Dharasena [II], who is the donor of the grant. He has granted the village Uṭṭapālaka situated near Sudattabhaṭṭānaka in the province of Surāṣṭra. The grant is for the following threefold purpose: (1) the worship of the image of Buddha; (2) the hospitality (clothing, food, and medicine) of the revered Bhikkhus; and (3) the repairs of the monastery.[1] The date is given as the 10th of the bright fortnight of the month of Māgha of the year 270 G.S., corresponding to A.D. 590. The messenger of the grant is the Sāmanta Śīlāditya, while the writer is Divirapati Skandabhaṭa.

TEXT [1]

Plate I

1 . . . . प्रसभ . . .

2 . . पोपनतदानमानार्ज्जवो . . . . .

3 सुतः तत्पादरजोरुणावनतपवित्रीकृतशिराः .

.

4 . नाथकृपणजनोपजीव्यमानविभवः प . . . .

5 . प्रशस्ततरविमलमौलिमणिर्म्मन्वादिप्रणितविधिवि

. . . . .

6 . . . मण्डलाभोगैकस्वामिना परमस्वामिना स्वयमुपाहित-
राज्या . . . . .

1 From the original plates.

---

1 For other references to Duddāvihāra, see Bühler, "Further Valabhī grants," *Ind. Ant.* 6, 13.—V.S.S.

7 . . . . . . स्यानुजः स्वभुजबलपराक्रमेण परगजघटानीका-
नामेकविज . . . . . .

8 . . . . . ल्पतरुरिव सुहृत्प्रणयिनां यथाभिलषितफलभोगदः
परम . . . . . .

9 . . . विन्दप्रणतिप्रविधौताशेषकल्मषः सुविशुद्धस्वचरि
. . . . . .

10 . . . . . . गतिपक्षप्रथितमहिमा परमादित्यभक्तः महाराजधरप-
. . . . . .

11 . . : प्रभृति खड्गद्वितीयबाहुरेव समदपरगजघटास्फो-
टनप्रकाश . . . .

12 . . नखरश्मिसंहतिः सकलस्मृतिप्रणीतमार्गसम्यक्पारि
. . . . . .

13 . . . धैर्य्यगांभीर्यबुद्धिसंपद्भिः स्मरशशाङ्काद्रिराजो-
दधितृदशगुरु . . . . .

14 . . . . . . तृणवदपास्ताशेपस्वकार्यफलिः प्रार्थनाधिकार्थ-
प्रदानानंदि . . . . . .

15 . . मण्डलाभोगप्रमोदः परममाहे . . . .
. . . .
.

Plate II

1 स्य संहतारातिपक्षलक्ष्मीपरिभोगदक्षविक्रमः विक्रमोपसंप्राप्तविमल[पार्थिव-]
श्रीः परममाहे-

2 श्वरः महासामन्तमहाराजश्रीधरसेनः कुशली सर्व्वानेव स्वानायुक्तकद्रा-
ङ्गिकम-

3 हत्तरचाटभटध्रुवाधिकरणिकविषयपतिराजस्थानीयोपरिककुमारामात्यादीन-
न्यांश्च यथासम्बध्य-

4 मानकान्समाज्ञापयत्यस्तु वस्संविदितं यथा मया मातापित्रोः पुण्याप्यायनाय
आत्मनश्चैहिकामुष्मिकयथाभि-

5 लषितफलावाप्तये दुड्डाविहारस्याभ्यन्तरेव ------ लकारितविहारे
भगवत्सम्यग्संबुद्धस्य

6 बुद्धस्य पुष्पधूपदीपतैलादि ---- चतुर्दिगभ्यागतार्थ्यं भिक्षुसंघस्य
चीवरिकशयनासन-

7 ग्लानभैषज्यार्त्थं विहारस्य च खण्डस्फुटितविशीर्णप्रतिसंस्करणार्त्थं च
सुराष्ट्रेसु सुदत्तभट्टानकसमी-
8 पे उट्टपालकग्रामः सोद्रङ्गः . . . . .
. . . .
11 . . . . धर्म्मदायो निसृष्टः . . .
16 . . . . दूतकस्सामन्तशीलादित्यः लिखितं सन्धिवि-
ग्रहाधिका – –
17 – – दिविरपतिस्कन्दभटेन सं २०० ७० माघ सु १० स्वहस्तो
मम महाराजश्रीधरसे – –

No. III.—Plates of Dhruvasena II, dated [Gupta-] Samvat 312

These are two plates, each measuring 13⅝″×10½″, and both have been inscribed only on the inner side. There are 23 lines in the first plate and 21 in the second. The date is given in line 44 and it furnishes instances of the numerical symbols for 300, 10, 2 and 4.

These plates have a close resemblance with the plates of Dhruvasena II, edited by Dr. G. Bühler and published in *Ind. Ant.* 6, 12.

The inscription is of Dhruvasena [II]. The donee is the Brāhmaṇa Mātrākāla, son of Skandavasu, of Bhāradvāja-gotra and of the Chandoga school. He is described as residing in Kheṭaka after having left Girinagara. The object of the grant is the field called Sārasakedāra, which is sufficiently marked out and distinguished by the boundaries given in detail. Looking up for the localities mentioned, we come across: (1) Girinagara, town at the foot of the Girnar Hills and to the north-east of the present town of Junagadh in Kathiawad; (2) Kheṭaka has been identified with Kaira of the Kaira and Mehmedabad Collectorate; (3) Koṇaka-pathaka, name of a sub-division of the Kaira District, and the village Hastika-pallikā it is not possible to identify. The date is given as the 4th of the bright fortnight of the year 312 [of Gupta-Valabhī era], corresponding to 632 A.D. Both Sāmanta

Śīlāditya and Divirapati Vatrabhaṭṭi (and not Vaśabhaṭṭi) are known to us from the plates of Dhruvasena II (*Ind. Ant.* 6, 14) and several others.

An Extract from the Text[1]

Plate II

31 . . . . . परममाहेश्वरः श्रीध्रुवसेनx
कुशली सर्व्वानेव यथा संबद्ध्यमानकां

32 समज्ञा[2]पयत्यस्तु वस्संविदितं यथा मया मातापित्रोः पुण्याप्यायनाय गिरि-
नगरविनिर्ग्गतखटक[3]निवासिभारद्वाजसगोत्रच्छ[4]दोगसब्रह्म-

33 चारिणे ब्राह्मणस्कन्दवसुपुत्रब्राह्मणमात्राकालाय खेटाहारविषये कोणकपथके
हस्तिकपाल्लिकाग्रेमे[5] अपरोत्तरसीम्नि खटक[6]-

34 माग्रेन व्रीहिपिटकचतुष्टयवापं सारसकेदारसंज्ञितं क्षेत्रं सभ्रष्टीकं यत्राघा-
टनानि पूर्व्वस्यान्दिशि अङ्कोलिकेदारः जरपथश्च

35 दक्षिणस्यान्दिशि मल्लिवापिवहः भर्त्रीश्वरतटाकवहश्च अपरस्यान्दिशि
मातङ्गकेदाराः तथा मल्लिवापी । वीरवर्म्मतटाकपरिवाहश्च ।

36 उत्तरस्यान्दिशी[7] वीरवर्म्मतटाकं । आदित्यभटसङ्कभ्रष्टि इन्द्रवर्म्मसङ्क-
भ्रष्टीच । एवमेतच्चतुराघाटनविशुद्धं क्षेत्रं सभ्रष्टीकं सोद्रङ्गं

. . . .

39 धर्म्मदायो निसृष्टो . . .

. . . .

43 . . . दूतकोत्र सामन्तशीलादित्यः

44 लिखितमिदं सन्धिविग्रहाधिकृतदिविरपतिवत्रभट्टिना ॥ सं ३०० १० २
ज्येष्ठ सु ४ स्वहस्तो मम

[1] From the original plates.—For the contents of the first thirty lines cf. *Ind. Ant.* 6, 12.—[2] Read समाज्ञा°.—[3] Read खेटक°.—[4] Read °च्छन्दो·—[5] Read °ग्रामे.—[6] Read खेटक°.—[7] Read °दिशि.

No. IV.—The First Plate of a Valabhi Grant

This is the first plate of a Valabhī grant, presented by Col. J. W. Watson, late Political Agent, Kathiawad. The second plate has not yet been traced, but it is possible that with the help of the

description, dimensions and other particulars given here, it may be traced out. Mr. Diskalkar, Curator, Watson Museum, Rajkot, has recently come across some more plates from Vaḷā, and we may possibly find among them the second plate of this grant, which evidently contains the vital portion of the grant.

The plate measures $15'' \times 12\frac{1}{2}''$ and is inscribed on one side only.

There are 30 lines of writing and the plate ends with the name of Śrī-Dharasena [IV]. In the genealogical portion there is mention of Bhaṭṭarka (line 2), Guhasena (line 6), Dharasena (line 10), Śīlāditya (line 13), Kharagraha (line 18), Dharasena III (line 21), Dhruvasena II (line 27), and Dharasena IV (line 30). It may be conjectured from the number of lines in the plate that the grant is one of Śīlāditya III.

An Extract from the Text

30 . . . [भ]ट्टारकमहाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वरचक्र-
वर्त्तिश्रीधरसेन:

No. V.—Plates of Siladitya III, dated [Gupta-] Samvat 346

The plates are two in number, each measuring $13\frac{3}{4}'' \times 11''$. Both of them are inscribed on one side only. There are 31 lines of writing in the first and 32 in the second. The date, which is given in line 63, contains symbols for 300, 40, 6 and 3.

The grant is issued from a "camp of victory" but the name of the village is illegible. The donor is Śīlāditya [III] of the Maitraka family of Valabhī. The recipient of the grant is Yajña-datta, popularly known as Yajña, who having left Ānandapura, was at the time living in Valabhī, who was a Caturvedin of [Gārgya-] gotra, student of Chandoga school and son of Śrīdharadatta. The object of the grant was two fields accompanied by two step-wells.

The date is the 3rd tithi of the dark fortnight of Mārgaśira of the year 346 [of Gupta-Valabhī era], corresponding to A.D. 666. The messenger is Prince Dhruvasena and the writer is Divirapati Śrīmat Anahila, son of Divirapati Skandabhaṭa.

An Extract from the Text[1]

Plate II

48 . . . . परममाहेश्वरः श्रीशीलादित्य×कुशली
सर्व्वानेव समाज्ञापयत्यस्तु वस्संविदितं यथा मया मातापित्रोः
पुण्याप्यायनाय आनन्दपुरविनिर्ग्गत-

49 श्रीवलभीवास्तव्यचातुर्विद्यसामान्य[गार्ग्य]सगोत्रछंदोगसब्रह्मचारिब्राह्मणश्री-
धरदत्तपुत्रब्राह्मणयज्ञदत्त प्रकाशद्धिनामयज्ञाय

50 सुराष्ट्रेषु कलाक्ष्येटके पद्मवाटिकग्रामे अपरसी – – – – – – – – – –
. प्रकृष्टभूपादावर्त्तशतपरिमाणं क्षेत्रं यस्याघाटनानि

51 पूर्व्वतः दासकसत्कक्षेत्रं ॥ दक्षिणतः देवकुलपाटकग्रामसीमा अपरतः
देवकुलपाटकग्रामसीमा च उत्तरतः ब्राह्मण[णर]ट्टकसत्कक्षेत्रं.

52 तथा अपरसीम्न्येव चोत्रारेकं पंचविंशतिभूपादावर्त्त परिसरा वापी यस्याः
पूर्व्वतः ब्राह्मणगोपदिन्नसत्कक्षेत्रं दक्षिणतः [बाल्ह]आरणक-

53 ग्रामसीमा अपरतः ब्राह्मणसरस्वर्ताक्षेत्रं उत्तरतः ब्राह्मण – – सत्कक्षेत्रं
तथा हस्तवप्राहारे – – – – – – – ग्रामे अपरसीम्नि वटभ-

54 लिरिका – – – – – – – भूपापदरपरिसरा वापी यस्याः पूर्व्वतः ब्रह्मदे[य]
मातृशर्म क्षेत्रं दक्षिणतः – श्वरक्षेत्रं अपरतः सन्तापुत्र-
ग्रामसी-

55 मसान्धिः उत्तरतः [कु–हास]मश्वर क्षेत्रं तथापरदक्षिणसीम्नि भूपादाव-
र्त्तशतपरिमाणं – – प्रकृष्टं क्षेत्रं यस्य पूर्व्वतः वि॑तं । दक्षिणतः
उम्बक-

56 क्षेत्रं । अपरतः खेटकप्रद्रकग्रामसीमसन्धिः उत्तरतः – – – – –
– – – एवमिदमाघाटनविशुद्धं वापीद्वयसमन्वितं क्षेत्रद्वयं
सोद्रङ्गः सोपरि-

57 करसभूत . . . . . .

59 . धर्म्मदायः निसृष्टः यतोस्यो . . . .

62 . . . . . दूतकोत्र राजपुत्रध्रुवसेनः

63 लिखितमिदं सान्धिविग्रहाधिकृतदिविरपतिश्रीस्कन्दभटपुत्रादिविरपतिश्रीमद-
नहिलेनेति सं ३०० ४० ६ मार्ग्गशिर ब ३ स्वहस्तो मम

[1] From the original plates.—For the contents of the first forty-seven lines, see *Ind. Ant.* 11, 305.

No. VI.—Grant of Śilāditya III, dated [Gupta-] Samvat 346

The find-place of these plates is not known, but they must be the two plates mentioned in the *Bombay Gazetteer*, vol. 1, part i, p. 92 note 3, as lying unpublished in the Museum of this Society. The plates are two in number and each measures 16″×12½″. Both of them are inscribed only on the inner side. Out of two rings one with the seal on it is intact, and it is 8″ in length with the seal which has its major diameter 2¼″ in length.

There are 30 lines of writing in the first plate and 32 in the second. The date is given in line 62 and furnishes instances of the numerical symbols for 300, 40, 6 and 7.

The inscription records the confirmation of the grant made by Śīlāditya [III] of the Maitraka family of Valabhī. The recipients of the grant are three Brāhmaṇas : (1) Soma who had come out from Kuśahrada, who was of Bhāradvāja-gotra, student of the Chāndoga school and son of Dattulika, (2) Piṭṭaleśvara come out of Girinagara, resident of Siṁghapura, of Vatsa-gotra, student of the Vājasaneyin school and son of Bhaṭṭi Hari; (3) his son Nāga. The object of the grant was (i) a field measuring 50 pādāvarttas, consisting of 3 divisions in the village Ḍaccāṇaka in the Hastavaprāhāra in Surāṣṭra ; (ii) a step-well known as Sirīṣavāpi; and (iii) a division of a field measuring 50 pādāvarttas in the village Vātanumaka.

The date of the grant is the 7th tithi of the bright fortnight of Pauṣa of the year 346 [of the Gupta-Valabhī era], corresponding to A.D. 666.

An Extract from the Text[1]

Plate II

45 . . . . . . परममाहेश्वरः श्रीशीलादित्य × कुशली

46 सर्व्वानेव समाज्ञापयत्यस्तु वस्संविदितं यथा मया मातापित्रोः पुण्या-
प्यायनाय कुशह्रदविनिर्ग्गत तच्चातुर्व्वेद्य[2]सामान्यभारद्वाजसगोत्र-
छान्दोगसब्रह्मचारिब्राह्मणदत्तुल्किपुत्रब्राह्म-

[1] From the original plates.—For the contents of the first 44 lines, see *Ind. Ant.* 11, 305.—2 Read °तुर्विद्य.

47 णसोमो तथा गिरिनगरविनिर्गतसिंघपुरवास्तव्यतच्चातुर्व्विद्य[2]सामा-
न्यवत्सगोत्रवाजसनेयिसब्रह्मचारिब्राह्मणभट्टिहरिपुत्रब्राह्मण पिट्ट-
लेश्वर तथा तत्पुत्रनगो इत्येतेभ्यः

48 त्रिभ्यः ब्राह्मणेभ्यः सुराष्ट्रेषु हस्तवप्राहारे डच्चाणकग्राम[3] त्रिखं-
डावस्थितं पंचाशद्भूपादावर्त्तपरिमाणक्षेत्रं खंडकुदुर्व्वागुग्गकप्रकृष्टं
यत्र प्रथमखंड[4] अपरसीम्नि विंशतिभू[5]-

49 दावर्त्तपरिमाण[6] यस्याघाटनानि पूर्व्वतः कुदुर्व्वासमुद्रप्रकृष्टं क्षेत्रं
दक्षिणतः डमरप्रकृष्टं क्षेत्रं अपरतः महेश्वरप्रकृष्टं क्षेत्रं उत्तरतः
सिरीषवापी प्रश्नीह । तथा

50 – – – म्येव द्वितीयखंडं विंशतिभूपादावर्त्तपरिमाणं यस्य पूर्व्वतः
नदी दक्षिणतः सैव नदी अपरतः ·भटिकाग्रामसीमा
उत्तरतः नदी तथा तृतीयखंड उत्तरसीम्नि

51 दशभूपादावर्त्तपरिमाणं यस्य पूर्व्वतः आदित्यदत्तप्रकृष्टक्षेत्रं दक्षिणतः
संगमदिन्नप्रकृष्टक्षेत्रं अपरतः दासकप्रकृष्टं क्षेत्रं उत्तरतः दासक-

52 प्रकृष्टक्षेत्रं । तथा अपरसीम्नि कुदुर्व्वागुग्गकमहेश्वररोतघसिंहो ब्राकृष्ट
सिरीषवापीति संज्ञिता पंचविंशतिभूपादावर्त्तपरिसरा वापी यस्याः
पूर्व्वतः

53 समुद्रप्रकृष्टक्षेत्रं दक्षिणतः गुग्गकप्रकृष्टं क्षेत्रं अपरतः महेश्वरप्रकृष्टक्षेत्रं ।
उत्तरतः संगमदिन्नप्रकृष्टक्षेत्रं तथा मपुमद्चाके वातनुमकग्रामे

54 अपरसीम्नि कुदुर्व्वामातृदासप्रकृष्टवडसंज्ञितं पंचाशद्भूपादावर्त्तपरि-
माणं क्षेत्रं खंडं यस्य पू॰र्वतः ब्राह्मणदत्तुलिकसत्कक्षेत्रं दक्षिणतः

55 तटाकं अपरतः दत्तुलिकसत्कब्रह्मदेयः क्षेत्रं उत्तरतः राजवट एवमिद-
माघाटनविशुद्धं वापीसमन्वितं क्षेत्रखंड – – – – – – सोपरिकरं
सभूत-

56 वातप्रत्यायं सधान्यहिरण्यादेयं सदशापराधः सोत्पद्यमानविष्टकं सर्व-
राजकीयानामहस्तप्रक्षेपणीय[7] पूर्व्वदत्तदेवब्रह्मदेयरहितं भूमि-

57 च्छिद्रन्यायेनाचन्द्रार्क्कार्ण्णवक्षितिसरित्पर्व्वतसमकालीनं पुत्रपौत्रान्वय-
भोग्यमुदकातिसर्गेण ब्रह्मदायो निसृष्टः यतोम . . .

. . . .

67 . . . . . . दूतकोत्र राजपुत्रध्रुवसेनः

[2] Read °तुर्विद्य.—[3] Read ग्रामे.—[4] Read खंडं.—[5] Read भूपादा.—
[6] Read परिमाणं.—[7] Read क्षेपणीयं.

68 – – – मिदं महासन्धिविग्रहाधिकृतदिविरपतिश्रीस्कन्दभटपुत्रद्दिविरपाति-
श्रीमदनाहिलेनेति ।. सं ३०० ४० ६ पौष सु ७ स्वहस्तो मम॥

No. VII.—Plates of Siladitya IV, dated [Gupta-] Samvat ·381

The plates are two in number, and each measures 13½″×12″. Both of them are inscribed on one side only. There are 32 lines of writing in the first and 33 in the second. The date is given in line 65 and it furnishes instances of the numerical symbols for 300, 80, 1 and 6.

The donor is Śīlāditya IV, while the donee's name seems to be Bālāditya. He is described as a Brāhmaṇa and a resident of Valabhī, who had migrated from Ānandapura. The name of the village granted is not legible. The date is the 6th of the bright fortnight of Mārgaśira of the year 381 G.S., corresponding to A.D. 701. The messenger of the grant is Prince Dharasena, while the writer is Divirapati Ādityā..., adopted son of Divirapati Haragaṇa. Haragaṇa is known from the grant of Śīlāditya III dated 342 G.S. (*Ind. Ant.* 5, 207).

An Extract from the Text[1]

Plate II

57 . . परमेश्वरश्रीशीलादित्यदेवः सर्व्वानेव समाज्ञापयत्यस्तु
वस्संविदितं यथा मया मातापित्रोः पुण्याप्यायनाय आनन्दपुरविनि-
र्गतवलभीवास्तव्यचातुरविद्यसामा-

58 – ग्राममेव च
श्रीवलभी ध्रुवाधि – – – – चाधिष्टयं ब्राह्म – – बालादित्य
– – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –

60 . उदकातिसर्ग्गेण धर्म्मदायः निसृष्टः यतोस्यो

. . . .

64 . . . . . . दूतकोत्र राजपुत्रध्नरसेनः
65 लिखितमिदं दिविरपतिश्रीहरगणदत्तकपुत्रादिविरपातिश्रीमदादित्यालेनोतिः।
सं ३०० ८० १ मार्ग्गशिर सु ६ । स्वहस्तो मम

[1] From the original plates.

STRESS ACCENT IN MODERN GUJARĀTĪ

By Alfred Master, I.C.S.

§ 1

M. Bloch in *La formation de la langue marathe* (1920), p. 50, says : " It has been generally deduced that changes in Indo-Aryan languages are due, like those in Romance languages, to the action of a penultimate intensity combined with an initial counter-accent according to Darmesteter's formula." He goes on to say that the description of the modern accent is also difficult and uncertain and that native grammarians have neither any idea of accent nor a word by which to designate it. He therefore deems it convenient to consider the regular variations of quantity and even " timbre " of vowels as dependent upon a rhythm purely quantitative. There is, however, he considers, a scope for an independent investigation of accent of stress or intensity in the individual dialects. This investigation, as M. Bloch has previously indicated in his thesis on the accent of intensity (" A propos de l'accent d'intensité en indo-aryen ") included in the Bhandarkar Memorial volume, *Commemorative Essays* (1917), should be made free from any historic prejudice and theoretic construction.

This method is clearly the only sound one and that adopted by Sir George Grierson in his article " On the Phonology of the Modern Indo-Aryan Vernaculars " (*ZDMG*. 49, 393 ff.) is open to the objections : (1) that it places all modern vernaculars under the same rules, and (2) that the reader is not sure that the writer has heard every word of the ten or eleven vernaculars cited by him under ordinary conditions and with his attention specifically directed to the subject of stress accent. This second condition is a hard one on which to insist, but it is at any rate essential that one language should be dealt with at a time, if it is intended to depend upon the writer's ear and not upon that of others. The necessity for this is clear, when we consider how accent varies in the mouths of the educated and uneducated in the same language. In English we find the word " contrary " pronounced "cóntrăry "

by the educated and " contrāry " by many who cannot be called uneducated. How much more will a writer, who has to leap from one language to another and from that to a third, fourth or fifth several times an hour, be unable to keep his ear-memory unaffected. A wine expert cannot hope to distinguish between Chambertin and Pommard, if he is tasting as well Claret, Port, Chianti and Madeira.

M. Bloch in "L'accent d'intensité " makes some wise remarks. He notes (op.cit. p. 361) that (1) for one and the same issue of air a closed vowel is less intense than an open vowel, and (2) for one and the same issue of air a sound is the more intense, the more it is raised in tone[1]. Further, the intensity as conceived by the speaker does not necessarily correspond with the intensity as heard by the hearer. In fact, the speaker may not realize that he is stressing his vowels at all. There is no doubt, moreover, that, in languages in which it is customary to pronounce every syllable clearly, the stress accent is less perceptible. But it is possible to lay a violent stress upon the syllable that naturally carries it without exciting notice, while if misplaced, the accent at once offends the ear. M. Bloch gives an instance in French, a language in which each syllable is given full value. M. Bloch also points out that the accent is varied by the position of a word in the phrase and that this must not be forgotten. He, finally, sounds the warning (already mentioned above) that the accent of intensity need not obey the same laws in every dialect.

It has not been possible in the present enquiry to carry out all M. Bloch's recommendations, because the conditions under which it was conducted made it unadvisable to attempt to form any theory till the material had been collected. It was thought, however, innocuous to recognize the influence which quantity and accent have upon one another and to arrange the material under quantitative headings. To have carried the process further and to have denoted the quality or timbre of vowels would have needed a more detailed research, which would have perhaps endangered

[1] Compare E. Clements, " Interpretation of Greek Music " in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. 42, p. 155 : " One has . . . to realize the difficulty of stressing a syllable without raising the voice or raising the voice in pitch, but not in loudness."

the main purpose of the enquiry. Accordingly, the quality of vowels has been touched on when very obvious to the writer only and in no way systematically.

§ 2.

The existing written evidence for accent in Gujarātī is rather stronger than that which M. Bloch has been able to find for Marāṭhī (*La langue marathe*, p. 52). It is unnecessary to go into this question in great detail as this paper in itself begs the question. The elder Taylor in his Gujarātī Vyākaraṇ (1903), p. 208, mentions prayatna, both high, low and mixed, which he differentiates from the Vedic prayatna, by stating that it lies only in the pronunciation. He frames a rule that the udātta or high accent falls upon the first syllable of the root of a word and the low (anudātta) on the following syllable. But if the suffix is heavy or of many syllables, then it attracts the high accent of the root, but not so that it becomes fully high, but mixed. An " unmixed " suffix may be as heavy as it can be, e.g. the suffix *-eluṁ* does not take away the accent of the root as káreluṁ, bóleluṁ. He goes on to give some other instances. The younger Taylor in his earlier grammar (1893) states that the accent generally falls on its first syllable while a secondary stress is laid upon any syllable immediately preceding a conjunct letter. He abandons this theory in his second edition (1908) and gives on pp. 9—11 a set of rules suggested by Sir George Grierson's article cited above. Khansaheb and Sheth (*Hints on the Study of Gujarati*, 1913) state (§ 354) : " Accent or prayatna is the stress laid upon a syllable, while pronouncing it." They refer later (§ 366) to accentual metre and say of the ' doharā ' metre, that the accent falls on the first, fifth and ninth mātrās. Finally Mr. N. B. Divatia in *Gujarâtî Language* and *Literature*, vol. I (1921), though in the earlier part of his work (p. 66) he seems to deny the existence of stress accent, yet subsequently, bases more than one argument upon the assumption that accent exists and his previous statement that accentuation does not exist in Gujarātī must be considered as tentative and not dogmatic. There is thus quite a considerable weight of evidence as to the existence of the accent of stress. Mr. Divatia's

experience shows that it is possible even for a trained philologist lecturing upon his own language to assume, at first, the non-existence of accent, as a matter of course, and to realise, as his theme developed, that the claims of accent to existence could not be ignored[2].

§ 3

The list of words which I have been able to gather will be found in Section 5 of this article, but it is essential before turning to them to give some idea of the manner in which they have been collected. They are for the most part tadbhavas in ordinary everyday use and only a small part of them are tatsamas or semi-tatsamas. A few words of foreign origin have been included. It would have been preferable, if, as M. Bloch suggests ("L'accent d'intensité," op. cit. p. 361), this enquiry had been undertaken by one whose native language is Gujarātī and it is hoped that it will be supplemented (or supplanted) before long by one who has a richer store of experience from which to draw and an ear trained from birth to the intonations of the language. I have chiefly endeavoured to avoid the fault to which M. Bloch refers, of the lin-

[2 I am afraid that Mr. Master has missed the exact point of my observations at p. 66 which he refers to. I have said there that the accentuation of words (not accent) which is noticeable in Upper India and to some extent and in a different form in Kāṭhiāvād is missing in Gujarāt proper. This accent is not the Vedic accent, but a sort of emphasis and stress, peculiarly marking certain syllables in words. I wished here to distinguish between this peculiar feature and the ordinary accent and hence called it *accentuation*. Perhaps I was not happy in the choice of the name for this feature. In the second volume (now in the press) I have tried to make my point clear. I have said there as under.:—

"At p. 66 of vol. I of these Lectures, last para., I have said that Gujarātī has not got the accentuation present in Hindī and Kāṭhīāvādī Gujarātī. This in no way conflicts with what I have said about accent here and in my treatment of the "silent" *a* etc. For, in the former case I speak of *accentuation*, which is more like *emphasis* than the principle of accent. Besides, the Kāṭhiāvādī accentuation is coupled with a peculiar intonation which gives it the nature of a pitch accent, as it were." If I am not clear still. the fault is in my language, not in my observation.

In fact ten years previous to these lectures I recognized accent in Gujarātī in my paper read before the First Gujarati Sahitya Parishad.—N.B. DIVATIA.]

guistic habits of the observer endangering the results of his inquiry. I have recorded the words in my list as soon as I have heard them, and there are very few which I have not heard, with my attention directed to the accent, in actual conversation. I have relied, as far as possible, not on my own memory or habit of pronunciation, but upon my ear kept alert for the stress of the spoken word. For the last six months I have almost daily visited villages in the Charotar of Gujarāt for ettlement purposes and for two months I have specially watched for accent. The people whose standard I have taken are mostly prosperous landowners with an ordinary education. Some words I have heard an extraordinary number of times. For example, the word kuvo (well), which Sir Ramkrishna Bhandarkar and Sir George Grierson accent kuvó. My ear tells me, after hearing the word thirty or forty times a day in all cases and numbers, that the accent is clearly on the first syllable, at any rate in the Charotar, and I am not aware of any different pronunciation in the districts of Ahmedabad, Surat and the Panch Mahals, with which I am also familiar. In cases in which I could not get the word involved actually pronounced in conversation, I have referred to a Bombay graduate, Mr. M. M. Shah, whose native place is in the heart of the Charotar. I have relied upon his intelligence to counteract the error which naturally arises, when a person is asked to pronounce a word, the speaker often deliberately trying to drown the accent in order to make each syllable clear. I have tried to obtain only the popular pronunciation of a word. For although the standard of excellence of pronunciation is that of the best educated, it is but an ideal standard. Moreover the learned are apt to be conservative, to retain old forms, to attempt to mould pronunciation to spelling, and in short to try to assimilate the modern speech to the ancestral Sanskrit. The masses are, however, progressive in tendency—the learned call this degeneration and corruption—and have a great influence upon moulding the course of the language. It would be interesting, indeed, to ascertain how many Gujarātī gentlemen of the present day use the word hāmbhaḷo for sāmbhaḷo in their own houses. A census would probably result in the substitution of *h* for *s* being termed a 'colloquialism,' and not a 'vulgarism,' as it is known at present.

§ 4

Orthography.—The transliterated spelling of the words in the lists is phonetic, so far as the limitations imposed by the standard characters allow phonetic spelling. Final inherent -*a* is omitted except in the case of conjunct consonants and medial inherent -*a*- is omitted, when not actually pronounced. There is a universal tendency to insert or retain the *a*, between voiced consonants (cf. hungry, vulgarly pronounced hungary) and it has been retained accordingly in words like uparī and bamaṇuṁ. It has also been retained between certain duplicated consonants. No conscious rule has been followed, the inherent *a* being retained in reliance upon ear alone. The Indian method of spelling hardly admits that a consonant can close a syllable, but it is difficult to maintain that the average Gujarātī, when he pronounces the word nuksān is conscious of emitting not two waves or beats of sound, but four (nukasāna). That the Indian grammatical convention corresponds with an actual practice in speaking, is maintained, and Mr. N. B. Divatia (*Gujarâtî Language and Literature*, pp. 206—214) is an advocate, whose views deserve the greatest respect. He will admit no value of less than half a mātrā for any inherent *a*, medial or final. He bases his argument partly upon ear and partly upon the practice of poetry. The acceptance of his views would entail differentiation in my lists between *a* of a full mātrā value and *a* of a half mātrā value, which would have no practical advantage over the established method. It will be noticed that the Vernacular Text-books spelling (which is a useful standard) has not been always followed in the case of *i* and *u*. Belsare's spelling (Gujarati—English dictionary) is more phonetic. *Ph* is always pronounced *f*. Grammars will not admit this un-Sanskrit sound.

Classification.—I have classified the words as disyllables, trisyllables, quadrisyllables, and polysyllables. They have been sub-classed according to quantity. The following signs are used :

(1) — long by nature,

(2) ✓ long by position, and

(3) ◡ short.

The term "long by position" is used not only in the metrical sense of Gujarātī poetry, but includes a vowel succeeded by two consonants pronounced as conjunct, but separated in Gujarātī spelling by a silent *a*. Final *-uṁ*, which is metrically long or short, is considered "long by position." The quantity appears to be governed by the shortness or length of the penultimate, but accent is not thereby affected. The vowels *e* and *o*, which are considered by the Gujarātī grammarian long by nature, are often short, when of open quality. Such cases have been noted, but perhaps not always consistently. Generally, it may be stated that unaccented *e* tends to become short and open,[3] while *o* is not so affected by absence of accent. There is a tendency indeed for unaccented *o* to become *u* and for accented *ū* to become *o*, but it is not part of the purpose of the present enquiry to work this out.

Some common doublets have been included in the lists, e.g. tuvar and tuver. The examples given are not confined to any particular number, gender or case and some forms may be at first sight unfamiliar. But it was important to take words as they came and it was not known, to begin with, how far inflections and affixes would modify the accent.

§ 5

Disyllables

A. Indigenous words

1 — — p'hélo, ghóḍo, vécāṇ, kắcbo, khéḍūt, ḷénār ; *but* dekhắy ;

2 — ◡ ék-samp, ānand, óluṁ ;

3 ◡ — cáḷkāṭ, kā́ñjūs, mā́ṇḍvāḍ, víśvās, kímtī, mádhyam; ágyār, sítter, páḍnār, lákhtāṁ, úpje, ā́ḍyo ; *but* sometimes babbé, caccā́r ;

4 ◡ ◡ sámbandh,. ghárḍuṁ, bássemं, híṇḍvuṁ, cā́ḍhtuṁ, sámjyuṁ ;

5 — ◡ ḍā́ṅgar, ā́vak, bóṭhaḍ, pā́ñcam, méku (coll : for meṁ káhyuṁ) ;

[3] Note, however, ek (one), with *short* e.

6 ◡́ ◡ úttar, kárvat, máṇḍaḷ, dábbu, lágbhag, síddha ;
7 ◡́ — sútār, mílāp, túver, júvār, kúvo, dáśī, kháro, pácīs, pácās, párāl, súnār, jánār, múāṁ, thátāṁ, cáḍhel, súdhī ; *but* patél, savā́r, niśā́ḷ, pradhā́n, ṣivā́y, arā́d ;
8 ◡́ ◡́ sánand, náṇand, sábandh, pálang, kúṭamb, páruṁ ;
9 ◡́ ◡ rámat, báḷad, túvar, lágan.

B. Persian and Arabic words

dívān, vákīl, sárkār, dávā, bákśīś, búјrag, vásūl, gárīb, núksān, pásand, fákīr ; *but* hazā́r, śikā́r, kitā́b, hajā́m, khasū́s.

C. European words. [English, or French through English.] hóṭal (hôtél), ā́lbil, (all well), páleg (plague), pólīs (police), *but* kalā́k (o'clock), galā́s (glass). [French :] kā́rtūs (cartoúche), pálṭan (pelotón). [Portuguese :] sā́bu (sabão), khámis (camisa), ástrī (estirar), túrang (tronco) ; *but* tuvā́l, (toalha).

Remarks on the disyllables

The accent is predominantly upon the penultimate independently of quantity, although in the case of the tadbhavas vécāṇ, pácās, mílāp, a European speaker would naturally accent the last syllable, which is the longer. The tendency is well marked in B, wherein a large number of words accented on the ultimate in the original Persian, the accent has shifted to the penultimate. Some words, however, like dívān, vákīl will bear an accent on the ultimate, especially in the mouths of the educated. The words gárīb and dávā are never accented on the ultimate. The treatment of European words reveals the same tendency to insist on a penultimate accent. Hóṭal and pólīs are particularly striking instances, the *o* of hŏṭal being actually shortened though receiving the accent.[4] Ālbil probably comes through Hindustānī as it is purely a police word. The exceptions to the rule are for the most part found in the sub-class 7 (◡ —), where the influence of quantity is most strongly felt, but they are generally capable of explanation.

[4] Cf. M. Bloch as quoted in Section 1 " a closed vowel is less intense than an open vowel."

Thus, savár (morning) is used principally in the form savâre and the similar word savâr (horseman), which is Persian in origin, would help it to retain the ultimate accent; niśāḷ is also accented níśāḷ; pradhán, a tatsama, has not been subjected to popular influence; śivây (is sewn) represents a form śivâe and retains the trisyllabic accent; śivây (besides) is, on occasion, accented on the penultimate; aráḍ or aḍhár (eighteen) is difficult to account for. It may have preserved its accent to avoid confusion with ardh (half), failure to distinguish between dentals and cerebrals being not unusual in vulgar speech. Paṭél is difficult also. But both aráḍ and paṭél are used as single word sentences and become more liable to a final accent. The English name Bílly is often (vulgarly) pronounced Billí in calling and paṭél is a very common form of address among kaṇbīs.

A. 1. ḍekhây is a form similar to śivây.

3. bábbe, cáccār (two each, four each); the accent is difficult to catch here. An accent on the final syllable must not be considered impossible, but it may be noted by way of comparison that children call the sound which a train makes getting up speed, chácha paísā (six paisā each), a rhythm of double accentual trochees.

5. méku (I told you) is a woman's phrase for meṁ káhyuṁ. Here the act of contraction enables the accent to shift. Other examples will be given at the end of this paper of similar shiftings of accent in the process of contraction of proper names.

B. The Persian words which have retained their final accent are not ordinarily in common use except by Musulmans, e.g. cópdī is used for kitáb, válaṇ for hajám; śikár is a sporting term, and khasū́s literary. Hazár (thousand) is, however, in common use. It is pronounced in Persian fashion with a Persian accent and for this reason the rules of transliteration have been violated. It is no matter of surprise that when the unique[5] pronunciation of the sibilant *z* has been retained the accent should also remain.

[5] The spelling of zād for jhād (tree) and of Zāz for Jahāj or Jhāj (the name of a village) represents the dento-palatal or dento-sibilant and not a pure sibilant. The influence of Persian (and perhaps also of the Parsis, Portuguese, Dutch and English) is seen too in the pronounciation of *ph* as *f*.

C. The. European words kalā́k (hour), galā́s and tuvā́l (from Portuguese toalha) are used by persons in constant contact with Englishmen, which preseves the accent; tuvāl is generally pronounced tvāl, cf. júvār, jvār and jār (great millet).

A rule can now be framed, that in the absence of any special reason to the contrary, *the accent in disyallables falls on the penultimate* and that the popular tendency to shift the accent from the ultimate in words which originally have it is often strong enough to overcome the conservatism of the educated, which resists any change of accent.

Trisyllables

D. Indigenous words

10	— — —	Dhā́ṛālo, mā́ṅgtāṁmāṁ; *but* rākhélī, vāvélī bolā́tī;
11	— — ✓	bāndhéluṁ, nākhéluṁ, devā́ḍvuṁ;
12	— ✓ —	gókalgāy, éranḍo, jā́jarmān, mókalyo;
13	✓ — —	khā́rḍāmāṁ; *but* bhatríjo, parsévo, sattā́vīs, paḍvā́no, samjíne;
14	— ✓ ✓	vā́paryuṁ, méḻavvuṁ;
15	✓ — ✓	parvā́ḻuṁ, sambhā́ḻvuṁ;
16	✓ ✓ —	sambándhī, durgándhī;
17	✓ ✓ ✓	áṅgarkhuṁ, dhúndhaḻvuṁ; *but* kaskástuṁ;
18	— — ‿	vāvétar, veḻā́sar; *but* témāṁthī;
19	— ✓ ‿	
20	✓ — ‿	máṇḍāmaṇ; *but* viśvā́śī, uttéjan;
21	✓ ✓ ‿	
22	— ‿ —	d'hā́ḍio, dókaḍo, nā́tīlo, ógaṇīs, ā́pīnĕ, vā́yalī (or vā́yelī);
23	— ‿ ✓	ósīkuṁ, bévaḍuṁ, mā́nituṁ, ā́yaluṁ (or ā́yĕluṁ);
24	✓ ‿ —	séṅkaḍo, búddhīthī;
25	✓ ‿ ✓	śíṅgaḍuṁ, dhártī-kamp;
26	— ‿ ‿	ā́ḻasu, vāyĕtar;

27	∨ ⌣ ⌣	vártaṇuk ; *but* parcúraṇ ;
28	⌣ — —	pathārī, kaḍākā, dhumāḍo, sitóter, bhaṇélo, apāyo ; *but* kámānār ;
29	⌣ — ∨	kálejuṁ, pháreluṁ ; *but* adhūruṁ, ughāḍuṁ, uchérvuṁ ;
30	⌣ ∨ —	párabḍī, ċámatkār, púravnī, vísaryo, sámajtā ; *but* acámbo, sabándhī, grahástho ;
31	⌣ ∨ ∨	váḍhakṇuṁ, páraṇyuṁ, rámakḍuṁ, *but* ajúgtuṁ ;
32	⌣ — ⌣	laḍāī, śikhāmaṇ, kuvétar, avāḷu, vadhārĕ ; *but* ghàreghár ;
33	⌣ ∨ ⌣	agátya, grahástha, virúddha, prasánna ; *but* vákhatsaı ;
34	⌣ ⌣ —	kálīyār, úparānt, úparī, váṭalī, váparāy ;
35	⌣ ⌣ ∨	bámaṇuṁ, ágharuṁ ;
36	⌣ ⌣ ⌣	ácarat, vákhatĕ.

E. Persian and Arabic words

baróbar, jarāyat, sapāraś (sifārish), anāmat (amānat) ; *but* tāluko, múkadam, dágalbāj.

F. European words

íspitāl, (hospital), sīsóṭī (society), āktómbar (October).

Remarks on the Trisyllables

The influence exercised by quantity appears to be confined to the antepenultimate and penultimate. This fact was not definitely ascertained, until the list had been made and there has been no time for rearrangement. In 12, 14, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 34, 35, 36 (*i.e.* the sub-classes with the first two syllables — ∨, — ⌣, ∨ ⌣, ⌣ ⌣) the accent is on the antepenultimate. In 12 and 14 the first two syllables are a long by nature followed by a long by position and the other sub-classes can be similarly identified, but are not quite exhaustive, 27 having an example of a penultimate accent and not being included. In 11, 15, 16, 28 and 32 we have a

series in which the accent is exclusively on the penultimate. The first two syllables are — —, ✓ —, ✓ ✓, ◡ —, and the series is less exhaustive than the former series. The words in the series, moreover, are, except in the case of 28, either tatsamas or semi-tatsamas or certain verbal forms.

Point 1.—The general principle of the penultimate accent is that a syllable long by nature attracts the stress accent more readily than a syllable long by position and the latter is in its turn more powerful than a short syllable. This principle will apply to all trisyllables of whatever sub-class, it being remembered that in cases of doubt the antepenultimate accent is preferred and that the ultimate syllable has no effect upon the accent.

In the remaining numbers 10, 13, 18, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, the accent is found both on the penultimate and the antepenultimate, which syllable it is, may be gathered from Point 1, and the five succeeding Points.

Point 2.—Words inflected retain the accent as when uninflected (except in the case of the verbal inflexions mentioned in Point 3); e.g. māṅgtāṁmāṁ (among (his) debts) from māṅgtāṁ. This rule overrides the rule in Point 1, e.g. dáḍāthī (with the ball) not daḍā́thī.

Point 3.—Verbs ending in *-āvo, -āvvo, -āvyo, -āyo, -āro, -āno, -āto* (m. f. and n.) always have the accent on the penultimate, even if the antepenultimate is long *ā*. Verbs ending in *-elo, -eli, -eluṁ* have an accent on the penultimate, which has a tendency to shift to the antepenultimate.

Point 4.—The penultimate accent, as seen above, is more favoured by tatsamas or semi-tatsamas than tadbhavas. This is possibly due to tardy disappearance of the final inherent *a*.

Point 5.—This is an expansion of Point 1. Of penultimates long by position those in which two consonants close the syllable attract the accent in preference to those in which the syllable is closed by one consonant not coalescing with the next, e.g. 30 a-cámb-o, but cá-mat-kār 'camb' is a possible word, but not 'matk.'

Point 6.—Reduplicated words with a connecting vowel take an accent on the last syllable with a counter-accent on the antepenultimate; so 32 ghàreghár.

The following conclusions may now be drawn :—

Conclusion 1.—There is a strong popular tendency always to accent the antepenultimate.

Conclusion 2.—There is a tendency not so strong to accent the penultimate, when that syllable is long.

Conclusion 3.—There is a tendency to preserve the accent of the original word in derived or inflected words.

Conclusion 4.—A steady influence proceeds from the learned to make the accent depend wholly upon the quantity as shown in the spelt word.

These tendencies and influences are conflicting and the fate of the accent depends upon the adoption or not of a word into the vulgar or popular vocabulary. It may be remarked that words pass into the vulgar vocabulary not only from the educated man's, but from the semi-educated man's vocabulary. For example, the word quinine in English is pronounced kvināin in Gujarātī and not kvinīn. This is due to the pronunciation of those not fully acquainted with English (who would correspond with the semi-educated in Gujarātī), who mispronounce the word because of their half-knowledge. This fact probably accounts for the curious accent of hŏ́tal from hôtel or hotel. The above conclusions will now be applied to a few trisyllables :

10. Dhā́rā̱lo is really a derived word from dhā́rvā̱lo. Europeans find a difficulty in the accent and are inclined to pronounce Dhā́ra̱lo or Dharā̱́lo ; vāvélī has as a doublet 22 vā́yĕli or vā́yalī, which is an instance of the popular overcoming the educated accent.

12. érando̱ shows the strong influence of the antepenultimate accent. The syllable *e* would be short, if unaccented, as it is open in quality.

13. parsévo. The closed *e* remains long and the fact that *par-* is a common prefix probably fixes the accent on the penultimate (see Conclusion 3).

17. kaskástuṁ (tight). I have not heard this in conversation recently and am doubtful, but give it on the syllable indicated by my informant.

18. vāvétar has a doublet 26 vā́yĕtar;—veḷ, veḷā belong rather to Marāṭhī than to Gujarātī, which uses vakhat and vār;—veḷā́sar has thus had little chance of alteration;—témāṁthī (out of it). The short *i* appears to be the result of the unaccented long syllable preceding it.

20. máṅḍāmaṇ is the deduction a money-lender makes from the sum lent before he hands it over to the borrower. It is also known as vā́ṭāv or kóthlī-cor.

22. d'hā́ḍio (day-labourer). I had written down for me by five or six educated villagers. Only the schoolmaster spelt it as written, the others substituting *dh* and *ḍ* for *d'h*, and *r* for *ḍ*.

22. dókaḍo means one per cent per month or 12 per cent per year (probably a couple—cf. séṅkaḍo—of annas a rupee a year or 12½ per cent, exactness not being a matter of importance in popular terms. Cf. half-a-dollar as English slang for half-a-crown, penny as American term for cent); nā́tĭlo is spelt nātīlo by the vernacular Text Book Committee and nātĭlo by Belsare's Dictionary. The more phonetic spelling is Belsare's. So āpĭne.

27. parcúraṇ means small change and is presumably a semi-tatsama from Skt. pracūrṇa. It is for some reason not affected by Conclusion 1. Cf. however 13 parsévo.

28. kámāṇār (about to earn). I have not actually heard it in conversation.

29. kā́lejuṁ. Taylor (1908 Grammar, p. 10) places the accent on the penultimate, but admits "a secondary accent scarcely less strong" on the antepenultimate. The uncertainty seems due to the conflict of the eye with the ear, or spelling with speech. It would probably be going too far to assert that the accent follows the aspirate, although there are several instances of aspirated accented syllables in this sub-class. In this connexion the remarks of Divatia (op. cit. p. 284) upon the movement of *h* towards the beginning of words, are interesting. In such cases the process would be reversed, the aspirate following the accent.—adhū́ruṁ is always spelt with a short *u*. I admit that the difference between short and long *u* before *r* in Gujarātī is not pronounced. Compare 27 parcúraṇ.

30. párabḍī, cámatkār, besides being affected by Point 5 above, may also fall under Conclusion 3, *-ḍi* and *-kār* being or resembling suffixes.

33. The 'penultimate' words are all tatsamas and the 'antepenultimate' word falls under Conclusion 3.

34. káliyār is a black buck; the educated person's word is haraṇ. Cf. English, donkey and ass; Latin caballus and equus. —váṭalī means perverted from Hinduism.—vápar āy can be accented on the last syllable like apáy. The passive *ā* is always hungry for the accent.

36. ácarat might be written ácrat, but vákhate cannot be written vákhte, although the accent would not be affected. The Gujarātī tongue seems adverse to joined consonants except nasals followed by occlusives, and occlusives followed by liquids or semi-vowels. A combination of occlusives or of an occlusive preceding a nasal is very distasteful. So we find fakat (Arabic faqṭ), sakhat (Persian sakht), ratan (Skt. ratna), lagan (Skt. lagna), nagad (Arabic naqd) and so on.

E. tắluko is often pronounced talūko by Europeans and múkadam, mukádam. Belsare gives mukādam for the latter word, but I do not remember ever hearing it.

F. The *ā* in íspitāl seems to indicate either Portuguese influence (Cf. nāṭāl=Christmas) or the influence of the semi-educated.

Quadrisyllables

G. Indigenous words

Note.—In order to reduce the number of sub-headings, vowels long by nature have not been distinguished from vowels long by position.

37 — — — — ghóḍāvāḷo, dhíṅgāmàstī, ògaṇcáḷīs, sắmbhaḷvāmāṁ, sámbhāḷvāmāṁ;

38 — — ⏑ — keḷváēlā, choḍáine, kālíngaḍuṁ;

39 — — ⏑ ⏑ nắṇāvaṭī;

40 — — — ⏑

41 — ⏑ — — mòkalắvo;

42 — ⏑ ⏑ — rā́vaṇio, phéravavuṁ, tarphā́ḍiyāṁ;
43 — ⏑ ⏑ ⏑
44 — ⏑ — ⏑
45 ⏑ — — — sàmajnā́ro, upāḍélā; *but* utā́vaḷthī;
46 ⏑ — ⏑ — paṭéliyo, sanā́ndiyo, prabhā́tiyāṁ, pharā́vavuṁ, vadhā́reluṁ;
47 ⏑ — ⏑ ⏑
48 ⏑ — — ⏑
49 ⏑ ⏑ — — pàṭəlā́ī, àgaṇóter;
50 ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ — bā́ḷadiyā, úpajaśe, pā́gathiuṁ; *but* avā́navuṁ, nirā́parādh;
51 ⏑ ⏑ — ⏑ àgiā́ras, àgaṇéṁsī;
52 ⏑ ⏑ ⏑ ⏑

H. Persian and Arabic words

tā́nduràstī, dā́galbājī.

Remarks on the Quadrisyllables

Quadrisyllables have, what we may call, the natural trochaic rhythm, when the first and third syllables are long. In such cases and when the second syllable is not long the accent is usually on the first syllable. When the second syllable is long, it tallies the accent. It is difficult to say whether the accent is predominately upon any syllable, but the penultimate is not accented unless long and not always then.

37. ògancā́ḷis has a distinct counter-accent on the first syllable. The accent is uncertain in sā́mbhāḷvā́māṁ. If the speaker thought it might be confused with sā́mbhaḷvāmāṁ, he would accent *-bhāḷ-*.

38. keḷvā́ela, choḍā́ine. Notice the short penultimate in each case.

39. nā́ṇāvàṭi is a derived word.

42. tarphā́ḍiyāṁ would, I think, be popularly avoided as difficult to pronounce. Either the accent on the penultimate or the antepenultimate makes pronunciation convenient and the antepenultimate is preferred.

49. The penultimate accent is more marked in àgaṇóter than pàṭalāī. It is possible that the counter-accent in àgaṇóter was formerly much weaker than now and for that reason the first syllable is not *o*, but *a*. If ógaṇīs represents ĕkūṇvīs through the stages *ĕkōṇīs, *okĕṇīs, ógaṇīs, then agaṇoter' would represent a still further stage, but I have no data for any such changes.

50. págathiuṁ. The educated pronunciation is given me as pagáthiuṁ. I have however verified págathiuṁ as the vulgar accent; nirāparādh falls under Conclusion 3, and avánavuṁ is literary; the latter, though appearing to be connected with navuṁ, is not given a rhythm of double accentual trochees.

H. Persian words. tándurà̀stī is surprising to a Persian student, who would rather expect tán-dúrustī.

POLYSYLLABLES

Note.—For the sake of convenience only the last three syllables have been classified.—

53 — — — mòkalāvāṇo, khàvaḍānāro, kéḷvaṇivāḷāmāṁ;
54 — ⏑ — mòkalāvavo, raḷīyāmaṇo;
55 — ⏑ ⏑ jāṇījòīne, ghāṇuṁ-kàrīne.
56 — — ⏑
57 ⏑ — —
58 ⏑ — ⏑
59 ⏑ ⏑ —
60 ⏑ ⏑ ⏑

Remarks on the polysyllables

55. jāṇījòīne is the only polysyllable I have actually heard in vulgar talk. The tendency to put the accent as far back as Point 3 allows when operative or as otherwise possible is still evident in the above examples.

§ 6

We are now in a position to frame definite rules of accent in spoken or vulgar Gujarātī not as a guide to pronunciation but as a convenient summing up of the conclusions reached in this

paper. I do not attempt to discuss Dr. Taylor's Rules (*Gujarātī Grammar*, 1908, pp. 9-11) to which I owe a valuable lead both in matter and method. He did not push the theory of early accent far enough, while his father, the elder Taylor, pushed it too far.

The rules may be divided into quantitative and etymological.

A. The *quantitative* rules are:

DISYLLABLES

1. The accent is on the penultimate. *Exceptions:* (*a*). Foreign words still retaining the original accent; and (*b*) a few indigenous words having the accent on the ultimate for special reasons.

TRISYLLABLES

2. The accent is on the antepenultimate:—*except* when (*a*) the penultimate is long by nature and the antepenultimate long by position or short, or (*b*) the penultimate is long by position and the antepenultimate long by position or short.

QUADRISYLLABLES

3. Words with short antepenultimate and penultimate take the accent on the first syllable.

4. Words with long antepenultimate and short penultimate take the accent on the antepenultimate.

5. Words with a long penultimate take the accent either on the penultimate with a counter-accent on the first syllable or *vice versa.*

POLYSYLLABLES

6. The accent is taken as far back as the etymological rules allow.

B. The *etymological* rules are:

7. The accent of the uninflected noun or adjective, of the verb-stem, or of the original of a derivative word is kept in the inflected or derived form; but

8. The verbal inflexions *-elo, -āvo, -āvvo, -āyo, -āvyo, -āro, -āno,* and *-āto* (m. f. and n.) keep the primary accent on the penultimate with a secondary accent on the verb-stem. The inflexion *-elo,*

however, sometimes loses the accent to the antepenultimate in trisyllables.

§ 7

In illustration of the operation of accent a few proper names are given. A lack of knowledge of Sanskrit and of Prakrit prevent me trying to trace accent through tadbhavas, but in the case of all words given below doublets in a fuller form exist.

1. Nārấyaṇ gives Nấraṇ. A common pronunciation of rāyaṇ (a tree) is rāaṇ or rāṇ. It seems probable that Nārấyaṇ became Nārấṇ and then the accent shifted back in accordance with Conclusion 1, giving Nấrāṇ. The unaccented ā then became short.

2. Bhấner, a village name. This appears to come from Bhāvnágar. A vulgar pronunciation of Bhāvnágar is *Bhāv-ná-ar. This passes inevitably into *Bhāvná-ir, Bhānér, Bhấner. The intermediate stages are physiological only, the spelling only recognizing Bhāvnagar and Bhāner.

3. Amdāvấd from Arabic through Persian Aḥmad-ābấd. In this word the three *a*'s, though of different length, are all pronunced like the French *a* in dame. It will be noted that the Persian accent is retained. This word gives the English ávadavàt (a bird).

4. Amnágar from Arabic through Persian Aḥmad+Sanskrit nagara. The form Amner does not appear to exist and the fact may be due to the late foundation of the town (about 1400 A.D.), when the Gujarātī language was becoming stabilised.

5. Máṅgrol (a village name). Rol or roli is not an uncommon ending of the name of a Gujarāt village. I heard the word in Cambay, representing Maṅglūr (S. Indian Mangalore). The stage of transformation would be *Maṅgrūl, Máṅgrol, unaccented *ū* becoming *o*. If this surmise is correct, it would indicate a Dravidian foundation of a village subsequent to the Aryan invasion, maṅgal being Aryan and ūr (ūru) Kanarese.

6. Khámbāt=Cambay. The orthodox spelling is Khambấyat. Here once more is the merging of *-āya-* into *-ā-* and the subsequent transfer of accent.

April, 1923.

THE TANTRAVĀRTIKA AND THE DHARMAŚĀSTRA LITERATURE

By P. V. Kane, M.A., LL.M.

The Tantravārtika of the great Mīmāṁsaka Kumārilabhaṭṭa is, apart from its depth, subtlety and abstruseness, replete with information on various topics. Among other subjects it sheds a flood of light on the ancient Dharmaśāstra literature. As it is now generally agreed that Kumārilabhaṭṭa flourished about the middle of the eighth century A.D.,[1] the incidental notices of the Dharmaśāstra literature contained in the Tantravārtika are of great value for the understanding of the development and chronology of that literature. In the following pages an attempt is made to bring together important passages bearing on that literature contained in the Tantravārtika.

In considering the question how far certain practices like the Holākā festival are restricted to the eastern people or are prescribed for all Āryas, Kumārila starts the discussion whether the Gṛhyasūtras and the Dharmasūtras, like those of Gautama, are restricted as authoritative to particular Vedic schools or have authority in all schools.[2] Then he makes the following interesting observations:—" The Dharmaśāstras of Gautama, Vasiṣṭha, Śaṅkhalikhita, Hārīta, Āpastamba, Baudhāyana and others—which stand apart from the Purāṇas, the work of Manu (the Manusmṛti), and Itihāsa (i.e. the Mahābhārata)[3]--and the Gṛhya works are seen to be separately studied in distinct caraṇas (Vedic schools), as is the case with the Prātiśākhyas. For example, the works of Gautama and Gobhila are accepted (i.e. studied) by the Chandogas (Sāma-

---

[1] *Vide* Pathak, *JBBRAS.* 18, 217.

[2] p. 179: देशधर्मानुदाहृत्य संप्रत्येतद्विचार्यते । किं व्यवस्थितमूलास्ते किं वैषां सर्वधर्मता ॥ ... आद्यं सूत्रद्वयं यावदिदमप्यत्र चिन्त्यताम् । गृह्यगौतमसूत्रादिव्यवस्थासर्वगामिते ॥

[3] The idea is that the Purāṇas, the Manusmṛti and the Mahābhārata are Dharmaśāstras, but they are not, by their very form, restricted to any particular school as the works of Gautama and others were.

vedins); the Vāsiṣṭha by the Bahvṛcas (Ṛgvedins); and the work of Śaṅkhalikhita by the Vājasaneyins only; and the works of Āpastamba and Baudhāyana by the Taittirīyas only. In the same way, after exhibiting how the Gṛhya works are restricted as regards their study to separate (caraṇas) the following matter should be considered, viz. whether these works are authoritative (respectively) only in those caraṇaṣ or whether all are authoritative in all schools."[4] The Siddhānta view is that all are authoritative in all schools. It is to be noted that in the above passage, Kumārila mentions by name six Dharmasūtras. Out of these the Dharmasūtras of Gautama, Vasiṣṭha, Āpastamba and Baudhāyana have been already published. A MS. of Hārīta's Sūtra has been found. The Sūtra of Śaṅkhalikhita is yet to come to light.

Among the Dharmasūtras Kumārila quotes the work of Gautama more frequently than any other. In some cases Gautama is mentioned by name; in other cases his work is quoted simply as Smṛti or he is referred to as Smṛtikāra. There are at least a dozen quotations taken from the Dharmasūtra of Gautama. In one place Gautama is spoken of as Gautamācārya.[5] In another place it is said that practices opposed to Vedic tradition are declared by Gautama not to be binding.[6] As contrasted with the tenets of the Bauddhas, Gautama is said to be based on Veda.[7] Gautama allows a person to practise the vow of 'studenthood' either for

[4] p. 179: पुराणमानवेतिहासव्यतिरिक्तगौतमवसिष्ठशङ्खलिखितहारीतापस्तम्बबौधायनादिप्रणीतधर्मशास्त्राणां गृह्यग्रन्थानां च प्रातिशाख्यलक्षणवत्प्रतिचरणं पाठव्यवस्थोपलभ्यते। तद्यथा। गौतमीयगौभिलीये छन्दोगैरेव च परिगृहीते। वासिष्ठं बह्वृचैरेव शङ्खलिखितोक्तं च वाजसनेयिभिः। आपस्तम्बबौधायनीये तैत्तिरीयैरेव प्रतिपन्ने। इत्येवं तत्र तत्र गृह्यव्यवस्थाभ्युपगमादि दर्शयित्वा विचारयितव्यम्। किं तानि तेषामेव प्रमाणानि उत सर्वाणि सर्वेषामिति।

[5] p. 106: यथा च ततः शेषेण विशिष्टदेशजात्यादिमन्तो जन्म प्रतिपद्यन्ते इति स्वर्गफलकर्मणो निःशेषोपयोगादन्यफलस्य चान्यत्र व्यापारासंभवात्ततोन्येनेति वक्तव्ये ततः शेषेणेति गौतमाचार्येणोक्तम्। This is Gautama DhS. XI. 29 (Ānandāśrama ed.).

[6] p. 138: ननु गौतमेनाम्नायविरुद्धानामाचाराणामप्रामाण्यमुक्तम्। This refers to Gautama DhS. XI. 20. This latter is quoted on p. 130 as the dictum of a Smṛtikāra.

[7] p. 117: न च तैर्वेदमूलत्वमुच्यते गौतमादिवत्।

twelve years or for 24, 36, or 48 years.[8] Two Sūtras of Gautama are quoted with slight variations.[9]

The Sūtras mentioned in the footnote below are quoted as Smṛti.[10] Some Sūtras are styled simply as *vacana* or *āgama*.[11] In a few places, though there is no Sūtra actually quoted, it appears as if the author has in mind the words of Gautama.[12] In one place Kumārila seems to be referring to an ancient reading of the Dharmasūtra of Gautama.[13]

The Dharmasūtra of Āpastamba is referred to in a few cases. "Āpastamba has laid down that certain practices are allowed in certain countries, though they are prohibited in others."[14] In another place it is said that if a doubt arises, on account of the words of the Āpastamba-smṛti, that the absolute prohibition of drinking (in some Smṛtis) is counterbalanced, that doubt is removed by the direct Vedic injunction "therefore a Brāhmaṇa does not (should not) drink liquor." This seems to be a reference to the words of the Dharmasūtra of Āpastamba laying down that "one who drinks liquor should (by way of punishment) drink wine as hot as fire."[15]

---

8 p. 112: गौतमेनापि द्वादशवर्षाण्येकवेदब्रह्मचर्यं चरेदिति प्रथमकल्पमाशु गार्हस्थ्य-प्रतिपत्त्यर्थमुक्त्वा द्वितीये कल्पे 'द्वादश प्रतिवेदं वा सर्वेषु' इत्यष्टाचत्वारिंशत्परिग्रहः कृतः। This refers to Gautama DhS. II. 51–52.

9 p. 109: तथा गौतमेनाप्युक्तम् 'राज्ञांच कार्याविघातार्थं ब्राह्मणानां च स्वाध्याया-निवृत्त्यर्थम्' । *Vide* Gautama DhS. XIV. 42–43.

10 Gautama DhS. XVI. 43 (on p. 130); IX. 4 (on p. 993); VIII. 21 (on p. 1117); I. 2 (on p. 143).

11 p. 136: मद्यं नित्यं ब्राह्मणस्येति वचनात् । This is Gautama DhS. II. 25, where we read ब्राह्मणः;—द्वैपायनस्यापि गुरुनियोगात् 'अपतिरपत्यलिप्सुर्देवराद्गुरुप्रेरिता-दृतुमतीयादित्येवमागमात्' । p. 134 (*vide* Gautama DhS. XVIII. 4–5).

12 p. 142: नन्वेवं सति ब्राह्मणस्त्रीवधेपि पुंब्राह्मणवद् ब्रह्महत्यास्तीति यदात्रेय्यामेव केवलायां भ्रूणहत्याप्रायश्चित्तविधानं तन्नोपपद्यते । *Vide* Gautama DhS. XXII. 12 or Āpast. DhS. I. 9. 24. 9.

13 p. 99: नन्वमेध्येन लिप्तस्य सा शुद्धिरभिधीयते । न लिप्तग्रहणं तत्र पाठेस्ति तु चिर-न्तने ॥ अमेध्यस्यैवं यस्मात्पठन्ति । *Vide* Gautama DhS. I. 45.

1 p. 138: सर्वेषामेवमादीनां प्रतिदेशं व्यवस्थया । आपस्तम्बेन संहृत्य दुष्टादुष्टत्वमाश्रितम् ॥ This probably refers to Āpast. DhS. II. 6. 15. 1 or II. 11. 29. 15.

15 Āpast. DhS. I. 9. 25. 3: सुरापोग्निस्पर्शां सुरां पिबेत् ।

The Dharmasūtra of Baudhāyana is referred to in one place as being in conflict with the words of Āpastamba. Āpastamba allowed certain practices in certain localities though they were opposed to Vedic tradition and declared that they were sinful in other countries.[16] This dictum of Āpastamba is refuted by Baudhāyana who cites only examples of sinful practices opposed to Smṛti.[17] Baudhāyana seems to be quoted in yet another place.[18]

There is in the present work at least one quotation from Śaṅkhalikhita.[19] It is cited for showing that the word Āmnāya is applied to Smṛti works also. It is noteworthy that the words quoted are not in prose but are a line of an Anuṣṭubh stanza.

Quotations from other Dharmasūtras could not be identified, if they exist at all in the Tantravārtika. Dharmasūtras are said in one place to give instructions about the duties of the castes and estates and that, as the dharmas are mostly uniform, the Dharmasūtras agree with one another[20] and are called Smṛti equally with Aṅgas. The dharmasūtrakāras are also referred to in another place on the binding character of usages.[21]

The Tantravārtika stands in a special relation to the Manusmṛti. Whenever Kumārila speaks of Smṛtis, that of Manu is uppermost in his mind.[22] He quotes it or refers to it even before the Gautamadharmasūtra.[23] He often refers to the Manusmṛti as

---

16 *Vide* note 14 above.

17 p. 139: आपस्तम्बवचनं तु बौधायनेन स्मृतिविरुद्धदुष्टाचारोदाहरणान्येवं प्रयच्छता निराकृतम् । This refers to Baudhāyana DhS. I. 1. 19-24 (Mysore ed.).

18 p. 993: तथा च स्मृतिः । न जीर्णमलद्वासाः स्यात् धारयेद्वैणवं दण्डं शुभे रौक्मे च कुण्डले । इत्यादि सूपपत्स्यते । Here the words धारये...कुण्डले seem to be an echo of Baudhāyana DhS. II. 3. 28. Compare Manu. IV. 34 and 36.

19 p. 139: स्मार्तधर्माधिकारे हि शङ्खलिखिताभ्यामुक्तं 'आम्नायः स्मृतिधारकः' इति।

20 p. 237: सर्वधर्मसूत्राणां वर्णाश्रमधर्मोपदेशित्वाद्धर्माणां चैकरूपप्रायत्वात्परस्परसंवादित्वं युक्तं ... स्मृतित्वं त्वङ्गानां धर्मसूत्राणां चाविशिष्टम् ।

21 Tantrav. p. 144.

22 e.g. pp. 69, 76, 115.

23 e.g. on p. 136: स्मृतिकाराश्च । आचारश्चैव साधूनां देशजातिकुलधर्माश्चाम्नायैरविरुद्धाः प्रमाणम्—इति वेदविरुद्धानामाचाराणां सामान्यतः प्रामाण्यमनुमन्यन्ते । The first is Manu. II. 6 and the second is Gautama DhS. XI. 20.—p. 195: प्रायेण मनुगौतमवसिष्ठादिप्रणीताः समानेष्वर्थेषु धर्मसंहता वर्तन्ते ।

'Mānava,'[24] which latter word is found very often in the Dharmasūtra of Vasiṣṭha.[25] Over at least twenty verses are wholly or partly quoted from the extant Manusmṛti. The quotations are scattered over all the chapters from the first to the last.[26] In some cases the verses of Manu are not actually quoted though they are referred to in such a way that identification is quite easy.[27] A few verses or parts of verses quoted in the Tantravārtika as Manu's have not been traced.[28] It is remarkable that a verse which is treated in the editions of the Manusmṛti as interpolated, because it has not been commented upon by commentators like Medhātithi and Kullūka, is quoted in the Tantravārtika.[29] The text of Manu that Kumārila had before him was essentially the same as that we now have, and the Manusmṛti was, according to him, the highest authority on matters of Dharma. It is not probable that this position could have been attained by the Manusmṛti in a century or two. Therefore the extant Manusmṛti must be several centuries older than 750 A.D. Modern scholars detect earlier and later portions in the Manusmṛti. Kumārila looks upon all parts of the extant Smṛti as equally authoritative. If we have to postulate two redactions of the Manusmṛti, then the earlier one, out of which the extant Smṛti could be said to have

---

[24] p. 642 : वेदानधीत्य वेदौ वा इति मानवम् । p. 80 : मानवेप्यभिहितं प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं च।

[25] Vasiṣṭha DhS. IV. 5 ; III. 2 ; XIII. 16 ; XIX. 37 ; XX. 18.

[26] Manu. (Nirnayasagar ed.) I. 21 (at p. 203); II. 6 (at pp. 76, 128, 130, 143); II. 7 (at p. 76); II. 18 (at p. 143); II. 44 (at p. 153); II. 140 (at p. 178); II. 125 (at p. 214); III. 2 (at pp. 112 and 642); IV. 61 (at p. 592); IV. 138 (at p. 937); IV. 178 (at p. 138); V. 56 (at p. 111); VIII. 57 (at p. 199); IX. 182 (at p. 135); XI. 28 and 30 (at p. 110); XI. 93 and 95 (at p. 136); XI. 96 (at p. 137); XII. 95 (at p. 117); XII. 105–106 (at p. 80).

[27] p. 591 : राज्यशब्दाभिधेयं परिपालनादि कर्म क्षत्रियस्येति मन्वादय: स्मरन्ति। This has in view Manu I. 89.— p. 110: जग्धवानापदि ह्यार्तो विश्वामित्र: श्वजाघनीम्। This refers to Manu. X. 108.

[28] p. 719 : तथा च मनुनापि स्वर्गं लोकं गच्छन्नभिहित:–तेजोमूर्ति : पथर्ज्जुनेति ।— p. 241 : यदपि मनुना पङ्क्तिपावनमध्ये वेदादेवोपलभ्योक्तं 'यश्च व्याकुरुते वाक्यं यश्च मीमांसतेध्वरम्'इति । — p. 110 : तथा च मनुनाप्युक्तमापद्धर्मगतं प्रति । तत्रत्यपापशेषाणामन्ते शौचं भविष्यति । कर्मणा येन केनेह मृदुना दारुणेन वा । उद्धरेद्दीनमात्मानं समर्थो धर्ममाचरेत्॥ इति ।

[29] p. 237 : पुराणं मानवो धर्म: साङ्गो वेदश्चिकित्सितम् । इति हि तुल्यवत्प्रामाण्यकरणं (अङ्गानां) । This half verse occurs after Manu. XII. 110.

grown, must be placed centuries earlier than the date to which the extant Manusmṛti can be assigned. This conclusion is immensely strengthened by the fact that Śabarasvāmin, the ancient commentator of Jaimini's Sūtras, seems to have looked upon the extant Manusmṛti as an authoritative Smṛti. For example, in his Bhāṣya on the Pūrvamīmāṁsā (VI. 1. 12) he says[30] "whatever is acquired by her (scil. the wife) in another manner must become the property of her husband and (an author of a Smṛti) declares, 'the wife, the slave and the son are all without wealth,' etc." In another place he says "Manu and others have given directions." This is not the place to discuss the date of Śabara. But from his archaic style and from the relation in which he stands to Kumārila, it may be said that he is certainly not later than 500 A.D. and may be earlier by a few centuries.

Kumārila starts an extremely interesting discussion about *sadācāra*.[30a] He quotes the Sūtra of Gautama (I. 3) "transgression of Dharma and also rashness are seen among the great" and then observes that many high personages such as Prajāpati, Indra, Vasiṣṭha, Viśvāmitra, Yudhiṣṭhira, Kṛṣṇa-dvaipāyana, Bhīṣma, Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Vāsudeva and Arjuna were guilty of transgressing the Law and even people of his time do the same. He then sets out in detail how these high personages of old transgressed the Law and tries to explain away most of the transgressions. Some of his explanations are quite after the manner of modern scholars of comparative mythology. The charge brought against Kṛṣṇa-dvaipāyana is that, being a 'perpetual student,' he produced offspring on the wives of Vicitravīrya. This is explained away on the ground that he was ordered to do so by the elders as also on the ground of his great *tapas*. Vāsudeva and Arjuna are blamed for having married Rukmiṇī and Subhadrā, who were respectively their maternal uncle's daughters, and for drinking *surā* (liquor)[31]. As

---

30 एवं च स्मरति । भार्या दासश्च पुत्रश्च निर्धना: सर्वे एव ते । यत्ते समधिगच्छन्ति यस्य ते तस्य तद्धनम् ।। This is Manu. IX. 416.

30a p. 127 : सदाचारेषु हि दृष्टो धर्मव्यतिक्रम : साहसं च महतां प्रजापतीन्द्रवसिष्ठविश्वामित्रयुधिष्ठिरकृष्णद्वैपायनभीष्मधृतराष्ट्रवासुदेवार्जुनप्रभृतीनां बहूनामद्यतनानां च ।

31 p. 128 : वासुदेवार्जुनयो: प्रतिषिद्धमातुलदुहितृरुक्मिणीसुभद्रापरिणयनम् । उभौ मध्वासवक्षीबौ इति सुरापानाचरणम् । The latter is a quotation from the Udyoga-parvan, 59. 1.

to the charge of drinking *surā* the answer is that *surā* which was produced by fermentation, etc., from food was forbidden to the three higher castes, but *madhu* (mead) and *sīdhu* (rum) were not forbidden to Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas, and that as Vāsudeva and Arjuna were Kṣatriyas and had only taken *madhu*, there is nothing wrong in their conduct.[32] As to the charge of marrying one's maternal uncle's daughter, the explanation is that in common parlance one's maternal aunt's son is also called brother and hence Subhadrā, though described as the sister of Vāsudeva, must have been the maternal aunt's daughter or the daughter of Kṛṣṇa's mother's paternal aunt's daughter (and so there is nothing wrong in Arjuna's marrying Subhadrā).[33] As to Vāsudeva's marriage with Rukmiṇī the reply is :—" How can he who was an exemplar (lit. mirror) to all the worlds and who said elsewhere (in the Bhagavadgītā III. 21 and IV. 11) 'whatever a great man does, other people do the same ; people follow what he looks upon as authoritative ; and men in every way would follow in my path, —set up a practice that is forbidden ? "

Kumārila then says that even in his day Brahman women of Ahicchatra and Mathurā drank *surā* (fermented liquor), that northern people gifted away, accepted and sold horses, mules, asses and animals with two rows of teeth and took food in the same plate with their wives, children and friends, while southern people married maternal uncle's daughter and took food seated on chairs and that both partook of food left or touched by friends and relatives, ate betel (tāmbūla) that had come in contact with men of all castes, did not ceremonially rinse the mouth after eating betel, put on clothes brought on the backs of asses and washed by washermen and did not stop intercourse with those who committed the great sins except Brahman murder.[34]

---

32 See pp. 136–7.

33 p. 137 : यत्तु मातुलदुहितृपरिणयनं तयोस्तन्मातृस्वस्रीयादिसंबन्धव्यवधानेपि भ्रात्रादिव्यवहारादविरुद्धम् । यद्यपि वासुदेवस्वसेति सुभद्राख्याता तथाप्युत्पत्तौ बलदेववासुदेवयोरेकानंशायाश्च निजत्वान्वाख्यानान्मातृस्वस्रीया वा सुभद्रा तस्य मातृपितृस्वस्रीयादुहिता वेति परिणयनाभ्यनुज्ञानाद्विज्ञायते । For वासुदेवस्वसा *vide* Ādiparvan, 219. 17–8.

34 p. 128 : The sale of horses, etc., was forbidden. Śabara on Pūrvamīmāṁsā, X. 3. 47 quotes a Śruti : न केसरिणो ददाति नोभयतोदतः प्रतिगृह्णाति ।

It has been said above (note 4) that Kumārilabhaṭṭa looked upon Purāṇas as authoritative works in the department of Dharma. The Purāṇas he means are not those ancient works to which reference is made even in the Upaniṣads.[35] His remarks in other places show that he refers to the Purāṇas that are now extant. In one place, among the topics of Purāṇas he enumerates the divisions of the earth, the lineage of royal and other families, the measures of time and distance, and future history.[36] In another place he quotes a verse which occurs both in the Viṣṇupurāṇa and the Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa.[37] He says that according to some by *svarga* is meant the top of Meru as established by reasoning in the Itihāsa (i.e. the Mahābhārata) and the Purāṇas.[38] In another place we are told that the Purāṇas speak of the Bauddhas and others who will bring about the confusion of Dharma in the Kali age.[39] Thus it is beyond doubt that at least some of the extant Purāṇas existed in his day and were looked upon by him as authoritative in the province of Dharma equally with the Smṛtis of Manu, Gautama and others. This irresistibly leads to the conclusion that some of the extant Purāṇas were composed several centuries before 750 A.D.

The foregoing will, it is hoped, give some idea as to how a close study of the Tantravārtika will yield valuable results for the history of the Dharmaśāstra literature.

---

35 e.g. Chāndogya, 7. 1. 2.

36 p. 79 : एषैवेतिहासपुराणयोरप्युपदेशवाक्यानां गतिः । उपाख्यानानि त्वर्थवादेषु व्याख्यातानि । यत्तु पृथिवीविभागकथनं ... किंचिद्वेदमूलम् । वंशानुक्रमणमपि...दर्शनस्मरणमूलम् । देशकालपरिमाणमपि...नुमानपूर्वकम् । भाविकथनमपि...वेदमूलम् ।

37 p. 126: यथर्तावृतुलिङ्गानि नानारूपाणि पर्यये । दृश्यन्ते तानि तान्येव तथा भाति युगादिषु ॥ *Vide* Viṣṇupurāṇa, I. 5. 64 and Mārkaṇḍeyap. 48. 44.

38 p. 255. 39 p. 127.

STUDIES IN BHĀSA

By V. S. Sukthankar

VI. *On the Prakrit of the dramas.*[1]

THIS IS A RATHER belated review of the thesis *Bhāsa's Prākrit* by Dr. Wilhelm Printz, which was accepted by the University of Frankfurt as 'Habilitationsschrift' in 1919, but which was not published till 1921.[2] It is undoubtedly the most important contribution[3] hitherto made to the study of the Prakrit of the thirteen anonymous plays attributed to Bhāsa, and as such it deserves a detailed notice. Moreover, as the author of the brochure contemplates incorporating the published material in a Prakrit Lexicon which he is preparing[4], it appeared desirable that before the material is finally embodied in the proposed dictionary, the thesis should be critically examined by some one who has made a careful study of these dramas. As I had already collected considerable data of a similar kind in the course of my study of the dramas, I was in a position to check without much difficulty the statements of Printz by comparing them with my own unpublished notes. The following review is the outcome of this comparison.

It may be stated at the very outset that the work of Printz represents the most painstaking, minute and comprehensive review, hitherto published, of the Prakrit of these dramas. As a monument of patient erudition it commands respect, and as a conscientious piece of laborious work it will be valued by every

[1] For the first five studies in this series, see *JAOS.* 40, 248 ff; 41, 107 ff.; 42, 59 ff.; *Annals of the Bhandarkar Inst.* 4, 167 ff.; *JBBRAS.* 26, 230 ff.

[2] Wilhelm Printz: *Bhāsa's Prākrit,* Frankfurt a. M., 1921, im Selbstverlag, pp. 47.

[3] The Czech contribution of Lesný to the Bohemian Academy of Sciences is to me, unfortunately, a sealed book. Its resumé, *ZDMG.* 72 (1918), 203 ff. is rather scrappy.

[4] See Printz's Einleitung (p. 3).

serious student not only of the Trivandrum plays but also of dramatic Prakrit. The searching criticism to which it is here subjected is not made in a captious spirit of fault-finding; it is offered with a view to increasing the value and utility of the work.

A defect which mars considerably the value of this dissertation is the axiomatic finality with which Printz postulates the authorship of Bhāsa; for though the attribution of the plays to this dramatist may be said not to have been satisfactorily disproved[5], it cannot be contended any longer, in face of the numerous valid objections raised against the theory, that it has been satisfactorily established either[6]. Not only does Printz categorically assume Bhāsa'a authorship, his methodology seems to imply also that the Trivandrum texts have been handed down in an almost unalloyed condition since the time of the supposed author Bhāsa! Printz deals with the Prakrit of these plays in the same confident way in which Prof. Lüders has dealt with the Prakrit of the Turfan fragments of Buddhist dramas[7]. In doing so, Printz has failed to take into account the essential difference of character between the two sets of manuscripts, not to speak of the manner in which they have been edited; he appears not to appreciate the elementary fact that Prakrit texts are liable to serious mutilation and corruption in the course of transmission through centuries, and that they need most careful editing. Printz's method of arguing is most unscientific.

Even a cursory examination of the Prakrit of these dramas is sufficient to show that the manuscripts are full of blunders and inconsistencies. Here are some *a priori* considerations which cast suspicion on the absolute purity of the text: the frequent elision in Śaurasenī of *t* in the termination of 3. Sing. Pres. (*-ti*) and in the ending of the Part. Perf. Pass. (*-ta-*) (Printz 32, 39); the uniform

---

[5] A. Berriedale Keith, Notes on the Sanskrit drama, *BSOS*. 3, 295 ff.

[6] See my Studies in Bhāsa V, *JBBRAS*. 26, 234; Pisharoti and Pisharoti, "Bhāsa's Works"—Are they genuine?, *BSOS*. 3, 107 ff.; Kunhan Raja, Bhāsa; another side, *Zeitschr. f. Ind. u. Iran.* 2, 247 ff.; Barnett, *BSOS*. 3, 35; and W. E. Clark, *JAOS*. 44, 101 f.

[7] Lüders, *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen*, Berlin 1911.

change of intervocalic *-th-* to *-h-* (Printz 16); the termination of 2. Plu. Indic. and Imp. *-ha* instead of *-dha* (Printz 32); the frequent change, in Māgadhī, of initial *y-* to *j-* (Printz 17); the (apparent) retention of *-yy-* (derived from Skt. *-ry-*) in Śauraseni (Printz 21); evident Dravidianisms[8] such as Śaur. *-nd-* instead of *-nt-* (Printz 19); uniform cerebralization of *l* (initial as well as double) (Printz 18); the forms *attabhavaṁ, tattabhavaṁ*[9] (Printz 22); palpable Sanskritisms like *vissasihi, samassasihi,*[10] *rodidi* (Printz 34), *āmantaāṇi* (Printz 32); and so on and so forth.

Another—and a more serious—defect in this dissertation of Printz arises out of the faulty classification of the Prakrits. It is extremely unfortunate that Printz (p. 6) should have thought fit to style as Māgadhī the Prakrit of the Cowherds in the two Kṛṣṇa dramas. It seems unnecessary to point out that a Māgadhī in which the Nom. Sing. of thematic stems ends in *-o* is no Māgadhī at all; at least not the Māgadhī we know anything of. This curious dialect of the Cowherds in Bāla. and Pañca. has all the appearance of being a western or northern dialect, and may, for the sake of convenience, be styled a variety of Śauraseni, as Weller has done;[11] but I fail to see how it could be called Māgadhī. Again, to bracket together the dialect of Indra (in Karṇa.) and of the Pugilists (in Bāla.), and to label them as Ardhamāgadhī[12] is not merely a 'Notbehelf' (as Printz calls it), but the height of inconsequence and arbitrariness. It seems almost as though Printz needed 'Belege' for Ardhamāgadhī in order to complete his case for Bhāsa; and the dialect of the Pugilists was the only one handy besides the few sentences spoken by Indra. These facts, unfortunately, make Printz's citations for Māgadhī and Ardhamāgadhī all but useless.

Since the appearance of the dissertation of Printz, our knowledge of dramatic Prakrit has been considerably furthered through

---

8 Pischel 275. 9 Ibid. 293. 10 Ibid. 495.

11 Dr. H. Weller, *Bālacarita* (Leipzig 1922), Vorwort, p. iii. Banerji-Sastri, Bhāsa: His age and Māgadhī, *Journ. of the Bihar & Orissa Res. Soc.* 1923, pp. 1 ff. admits under Māgadhī the dialects of Unmattaka and Śakāra only.

12 Konow, *Das indische Drama* § 11, hesitatingly assigns Ardhamāgadhī to the dialect of Indra (Karṇa.) only.

the publication of the southern texts of other dramas.[13] The additional light thrown by these publications on the practice of southern dramatists and southern scribes will necessitate correction in many a hasty generalization of Printz, based on an observation of too narrow a field.

With these preliminary remarks we may proceed to an examination of Printz's treatment of the grammar of the Prakrit of these plays, which begins on p. 8 and comprises the major part of the thesis.

Page 8. (*Line* 5.) Ś. *pāuḍa-* (*prākṛta-*) Avi. 29 has the usual meaning 'common'; *pāuḍagaṇiā* means 'a common prostitute'; and therefore it is not necessary to stretch *pāuḍa-* to mean 'weggejagt,' as P. does.—(*Line* 6.) There is no need to trace back *pākida-* Pratijñā. 13 to *prakṛta-*, since *prākṛtaḥ* (Pkt. *pākido* 'a common fellow') gives a thoroughly satisfactory sense without any difficulty.—(*Line* 12.) *rasabha-* and *gorasaha-* Bāla. 15 are not Māg.; they may be said to belong to a sub-variety of Śaur. assigned to Cowherds.—(*Line* 13.) *hiaa-* Bāla. 54 is likewise not Māg.—Thus the distinction that P. tries to draw between the Śaur. and Māg. treatments of *ṛ* (*line* 9) on the ground of the instances cited by him in the first paragraph is illusory.—(*Line* 18.) Ś. *-uttiṁ* ifc. Pratijñā. 44 is noteworthy only as an orthographical peculiarity; for the elision of medial *v* in these mss. cf. Printz 19. The *v* of *-vutti-* has been correctly retained in *sāhāraṇavuttiṁ* Cāru. 7. Ś. *uttanta-* (*vṛttānta-*) Pratijñā. 18, Abhi. 24 appears not to have even that justification. There should be no hesitation in correcting the text reading to *vuttanta*, since the former appears to owe its existence to the influence of such doubtful forms as *pāutta-* Pratijñā. 51, *saṁpāuda-* Bāla. 9.—(*Line* 24.) *amida-* Bāla. 39 is

[13] Among others Mattavilāsa (Trivandrum Skt. Series, no. 55), Kalyāṇasaugandhika (*BSOS.* 3, 33 ff.), and the prologue of the Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi (*BSOS.* 3, 116 f.), besides the southern recensions of classical and post-classical dramas, published in the Trivandrum Skt. Series and elsewhere.—For important additions of lengthy Māgadhī passages unknown to Pischel and perhaps to Printz, see now W. E. Clark, Māgadhī and Ardhamāgadhī, *JAOS.* 44, 96, footnote 44.

taken from the speech of Vṛddhagopālaka and is therefore not Māg.

Page 9. (*Line* 4.) As we find *yeva* (i.e. *eva* with prefixed *y-*) even in the Old Śaur. of the Turfan fragments (Lüders 59), the Śaur. *e(v)va* of our mss. would appear to be an orthographical blunder; it is probably nothing more than a Sanskritism!—(*Line* 32.) In *odaradī via* (*avatarati iva*) Cāru. 51 etc. there appears to be a confusion between the use of the enclitikon *-vva* (with subsequent elision of one *v* and compensation lengthening) and that of Ś. *via*.[14] The alternative forms are *odaradīva* (for *odaradi-vva*) and *odaradi via*; the hybrid forms of our mss. appear to be utterly without justification.

Page 10. (*Line* 13.) There is no shortening of the end vowel in *haddhi* (*hā dhik*), which is arrived at by a regular elision of the final consonant; on the other hand there is an anomalous lengthening of the end vowel in *haddhī* cited by P. from Śak.—(*Line* 17.) As the short final of vocatives of nouns ending in *-a* alternated frequently with the pluti vowel,[15] it is highly improbable that the initial of *khu* should be doubled just after a vocative, when it is not doubled in any other position. Weller (ed. Bālacarita, p. 38) is therefore perfectly justified in emending the ms. reading *kkhu* (in the four isolated cases in) Bāla. 34 to *khu*. –(*Line* 21.) *dhikkhu*= *dhik-khalu* and not *dhīk khalu*.—(*Line* 30.) As the Old Śaur. of Turfan fragments shows *yeva*, the form Ś. *īdisavaṇṇayyeva* (*īdṛsavarṇā+eva*), condemned by P., appears to be correct Pkt.; on the other hand the spurious forms *e(v)va*, approved of by P., have all the appearance of being unauthorized Sanskritisms, as already remarked. –(*Line* 34.) *durattaṇayyeva* Bāla. 18 is not Māg.

Page 11. (*Line* 9.) Ś. *-matta-* (*-mātra-*) ifc. occurs likewise in Kalyāṇasaugandhika (ed. Barnett, *BSOS*. 3, 37), *ettiammatto maggo*.

---

14 Pischel's observation is that *iva* becomes *-vva* after short vowels sporadically in verses only; one of the examples cited by him is: *samūsasanti-vva*. But the rule holds good only for Mahār., Ardham. and Jaina Mahār. (*Gramm. Pkt. Spr.* 143.)

15 See Pischel 71. The length is maintained even in the tertiary stage; cf. Bloch, *La formation de la langue marathe*, p. 180.

If it is an archaism, as it appears to be, it is probably one common to all Malayalam mss., and not peculiar to the Trivandrum plays. Hema. 1. 81 cites, as a matter of fact, both variants *matta-* and *metta-*. —(*Line* 34.) P. implies that the form *purusa-* is older than *purisa-*. It may be so. But Mārkaṇḍeya, Prākṛtasarvasva 9.9, assigns *purusa-* to Śaur. and *purisa-* to Mahārāṣṭrī. This suggests that the difference between them is really dialectic, a view fully endorsed by the ground-form **pūrṣa-* (Wackernagel, *Altind. Gram.* 1. § 51). In the northern mss., the Mahārāṣṭrī form *purisa-* appears to have been stereotyped. In our mss., however, *purusa-* may be merely an incorrect (or accidentally correct) Tadbhava.

Page 12, *line* 20. Ś. *arihadi*, etc. I adhere to the views expressed in my Studies in Bhāsa I, *JAOS*. 40, 252 f., despite the remarks of Printz on p. 46.

Page 13, *line* 3. With *-puruva-* (*-pūrva-*) ifc. of our mss. compare *diṭṭhapuru*[*vo*] of the Turfan Fragments (Lüders 50), not noticed by P.

Page 14, *line* 19. P. mentions *oggada-* Bāla. 9,12 as an exception to the rule that the preposition *apa-* appears invariably as *ava-*; but, as a matter of fact, it is better to trace *oggada-* to *udgata-*[16] than to *apagata-* (proposed by Chāyā); for the instances of the change of short *u* to short *o*, see Printz 11 f.

Page 15. (*Line* 18.) The explanation of *ṣuṭṭhu idaṁ* Bāla. 42 (proposed in the Chāyā and accepted by P.) is unsatisfactory. In view of *ṣuṭṭhu gāidaṁ* in the parallel passage, Pañca. 22, either read *ṣuṭṭhu idaṁ*, or correct the text to *ṣuṭṭhu gāidaṁ*, following Weller, ed. Bālacarita, p. 49. There should be really no hesitation in making the correction, since the text of the Trivandrum edition is based on one single ms., which swarms with mistakes. — (*Line* 11.) The change of *-th-* to *-h-* (instead of *-dh-*) in Śaur. appears to be a characteristic of these Malayalam mss.; thus Kalyāṇas. (ed. Barnett) has *kahaṁ* (pp. 36, 37, Skt. *katham*), *ṇāha-* (pp. 40, 41, 48, Skt. *nāthā-*), etc. Similarly in the extract from the Prologue of the Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi (*BSOS*. 3, 117) published by Pisharoti.

---

16 Apte's Dictionary gives sub voce *ud-gam-* the meaning 'to depart (as life).'

Page 16, *line* 15. P. does not give the reference for *aghaṁ*= *dhīk*; but I expect that the Chāyā spells it correctly as *dhik*.

Page 17. (*Line* 13.) As regards the change of *cch* to *śc*, it should be remembered that the rule is seldom followed in the mss. of dramas. Pischel admits that the texts have mostly *cch*, and although he adds that the mss. show distinct traces of this rule, he cites only instances from the Mṛccha. and the Com. Pṛthvīdhara. To judge by the dramatic texts published in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series (such as the Mattavilāsa, Subhadrādhanaṁjaya and others), the Malayalam mss. show uniformly *cch*[17]. --(*Line* 14.) The instances P. quotes for the retention of *y* in Māgadhī have been taken mostly from the speeches of Cowherds in the two Kṛṣṇa dramas, and are therefore, for reasons already given, perfectly irrelevant. Moreover, the instances cited for the irregular change of *y* to *j* in Māg. are more numerous than for the correct retention of *y*. Conversely, the instances for the incorrect retention of *y* in Śaur. are almost as numerous as those for the regular change of *y* to *j*. In fact, the treatment of *y-j* in the mss. of our dramas is inconsequent to a degree, violating all rules of Pkt. grammar, and cannot therefore be made the basis of any inference like that drawn by P.

Page 18. (*Line* 16.) The rule regarding the change of *r* to *l* is not applicable to the cases P. has in view, the dialect in question not being Māg.; so there is probably no text corruption.—(*Line* 36.) *ḻ* for *l* appears to be a characteristic of Malayalam mss.; cf. Kalyāṇas. (ed. Barnett) p. 41 *ḻakkhīadi*, p. 42 *sagga-ḻacchī*, p. 49 *bahaḻattaṇa*.—But it is never carried out quite so consistently as in the Trivandrum texts. My surmise is that the editor has normalized the spelling and written *ḻ* throughout, irrespective of the ms. spelling.

Page 20. (*Line* 13.) The confusion between the Śaur. and Māg. treatments (*-ṇṇ-* and *-ññ-*) of the Skt. *-jñ-* is so complete in our mss. and besides so common in all classes of mss. that to my mind it is most uncritical to assume that *-ṇṇ-* has crept into our texts through contamination with younger texts. –(*Line* 15.) The examples *yañña-* Bāla. 9 and *ḻañño* Bāla. 10 cited by P. as Māg.

---

17 See W. E. Clark, *JAOS*. 44, 82-93.

are not Māg.—(*Line* 17.) The treatment of Skt. *-ny-* is analogous and P. himself cites a very illuminating example: Ś. *dakkhiññadā*, *sadakkhiñña*, *sadakkhiṇṇa*, and *adakkhiṇṇa*.—(*Line* 33.) Owing to the uncertainty characterizing the ligature *-yy-* in southern mss., we cannot attach much importance to the spelling *uyyāṇa-* (*udyāna-*) Avi. 2, 4; it may be read as *uyyāṇa-* or as *ujjāṇa-*; see below.

Page 21. (*Line* 4 f.) The examples *aṇṇa-*, *kaṇṇaā*, and *ṇāsa-* cited by P. from Bāla. are not Māg., but, as pointed out often enough above, a variety of Śaur.—(*Line* 12.) Barnett in his edition of the Kalyāṇas. (*BSOS.* 3, 36, footnote 5) states that in his ms. the word *ayya* is spelt *aṁya*[18], and therefore in all likelihood the Trivandrum mss. also follow the same orthography, although Ganapati Sastri is silent on the point. It must thus be regarded as still uncertain whether the ligature is to be read as *-yy-* or as *-jj-*, or again be looked on as representing a sound intermediate between the two (Pischel 193, 284). P. adds that the reading *-yy-* is assured, because of the hesitating orthography in words like *ṇiyyādedi-ṇiādedi*, but in this P. is grossly mistaken; for P. admits that *-j-* is preserved only—or at least mostly—at the point of contact in a compound, but is elided generally in the middle of a word (Printz 15); *ṇiādedi* may therefore stand for *ṇijādedi* as well as for *ṇiyādedi*, since intervocalic *-j-* is dropped in the same way as intervocalic *-y-*, cf. *antaa-* (*antaja-*) Avi. 14, *pūaṇīa-*(*pūjanīya-*) Cāru. 34, *rāā* (*rājā*) Svapna. 6, etc. Thus it is evident that it is a futile attempt to try to place the treatment of Skt. *-ry-* in our dramas on the same footing as in the Turfan Fragments.[19]

Page 22, *line* 13. The Chāyā is perfectly right in explaining the compound *saṭṭhīkida-* as *ṣaṣṭhīkṛta-*; see Morgenstierne, *Ueber das Verhältnis zwischen Cāru. u. Mṛccha.* 30. The rendering of P. is grammatically faultless; unfortunately it makes no sense. Expand the compound *ṣaṣṭhī*(*saṁbandhi*)*kṛtadevakārya-* (=*kṛtaṣaṣṭhīsaṁbandhidevakārya-*) 'one who has performed the religious duties

---

18 See also his footnote to Pisharoti's transliteration of the Prologue of the Āscaryacūdāmaṇi, *BSOS.* 3, 116.

19 Lesny (*ZDMG.* 72, 207) has fallen in the same trap, through the omission of the editor to report about the orthographical peculiarity of southern mss.

(pertaining) to the sixth'; for the transposition of the members of a compound, see Pischel 603; for the significance of the *sixth*, see the discussion on the tithi scheme and the time analysis of the Cāru. in my Studies in Bhāsa III, *JAOS*. 42, 67 ff. Lastly, it may be pointed out that the usual reflex of *-rth-*, in our plays, is *-tth-* and not *-ṭṭh-*; cf. *atthavāvārā* (*arthavyāpārā*) Cāru. 10, *attha-* (*artha-*) Svapna. 54, and elsewhere.

Page 23, *line* 12. P. has failed to notice that *ṇikkhanta-* of our dramas has a parallel in *nikkhanta-* of the Turfan Fragments (Lüders 61).

Page 26. (*Line* 12.) The Māg. in which the Nom. Sing. of thematic stems ends in *-o*, as already remarked, is no Māg.[20] Printz's treatment of the dialect of the Cowherds as Māg. has been rightly rejected by Weller, ed. Bāla. Vorwort, p. iii f. –(*Line* 14.) Better to correct the text reading to *Ṇandagovaputto paṣūdo* Bāla. 35 as Weller (op. cit. p. 40) has done, because the construction of a loc. abs. with *jadappahudi* is harsh. –(*Line* 15.) The Ardham. in which the Nom. Sing. of thematic stems ends in *-o* is no Ardham.—(*Line* 30.) It is a notable observation of P. that in the plays before us there are instances of Acc. Plu. Masc. ending in *-āṇi* in Śaur. and Māg. But his remarks on the subject call forth following comment. (1) All the examples cited by P. but one are from Śaur.; the exception is *amhāḻiśakāṇi* Cāru. 14. (2) With the exceptions of two adjectives, *tādisāṇi* and *amhāḻiśakāṇi*, all the words refer to inanimate objects (*kesa, gucchaa, guṁhaa, guṇa, paāra, māsaa, phaṇa, saaḍaa* and *paṭaha*). (3) In the example *tāṇi dāva sehāḻiāgumhaāṇi pekkhāmi kusumidāṇi vā ṇa vetti* Svapna. 33, *gumhaāṇi* is Nom. Plu. and not Acc. Plu. P. was evidently misled by the position of *pekkhāmi* and has taken *gumhaāṇi* as its object. The object of *pekkhāmi*, however, is not *gumhaāṇi*, but the whole sentence *tāṇi*

[20] The use of the cerebral *ṣ* is certainly peculiar. Though unnoticed by Prakrit grammarians it is not altogether unknown to Prakrit orthography. The Shahbazgarhi, Mansera and Kalsi versions of Aśoka's edicts are full of words spelt with the cerebral *ṣ*. A few examples chosen at random are: Rock Edict XII Sh *savraprasaṁdani*, M *savraprasadani*, K *savāpāṣaṁdani*; III M *pariṣa*; XIII K *ṣe athi anuṣaye*; ibid. *aṭhavaṣābhisitasā devānaṁ piyaṣa Piyadaṣine lājine*; VIII Sh *daśavaṣabhisito sato*.

dāva sehāḷiā° etc. (4) Pkt. grammarians (Hema. 1.34) permit the optional forms *guṇā* (m.) and *guṇāiṁ* (n.) and therefore the suggested change in Cāru. 47 is quite uncalled for; P. has here again been misled by the Chāyā. The text reading is *ekapurusapakkhavādidā savvaguṇāṇaṁ hanti*; and P. wants to correct the text reading *guṇāṇaṁ* to *guṇāṇi*; but *guṇāṇaṁ* is clearly nothing more than an incorrect contraction of *guṇā ṇaṁ*. (5) It is questionable whether we have to correct *pāṇāṇi* (Svapna.) to *pāṇā*, or to correct *pāṇā* (Pratijñā.) to *pāṇāṇi*; or again to let them both stand, like so many doublets in Pkt. (6) With regard to *māsaāṇi*, it should be remarked that in Cāru. 5 the Nom. Plu. has the identical form *māsaāṇi*[21], which makes it doubtful whether in Pratijñā. the word is used as mas. or as neut. (7) If *śakaṭa-* is n., *saaḍaa-* could, I think, quite easily be also n. I am not able to check the example, as P. has omitted to give the reference to the text. (8) As a reference to the Petersb. Dict. will show, *paṭaha-* is used sometimes as n and what is more important is that the passage cited (Bāla. 62) is not Ardham. (9) P. has not given a single instance of any of these words being actually used *in these plays* with masc. ending to show that they are used in the Prakrit of these dramas as masc. nouns; on the other hand, he has cited (p. 25) a number of cases in which the gender has actually changed from m. to n.: *ankuśa, puruṣakāra, guḍa, naraka, vāsa, svapna,* and *taṇḍula,* some of which are used in both genders indiscriminately. And as pointed out above, none of these words (with the exception of the two adjectives) are protected against neutralization by their meaning, as they are all names of inanimate objects. (10) Lastly, it is worth remembering that Prof. Lüders, after a most exhaustive and minute investigation of the entire material, has succeeded in establishing this peculiar form for Ardham. and Māg. only; for Śaur. its propriety is still questionable (Lüders, Epigraphische Beiträge III=*Sitzungsb. Preuss. Akad.* 1913, p. 1009). It should seem then that while there is a distinct possibility that some of the instances cited by P. are Acc. Plu. Masc. formed with the termination *-āṇi*, in others there has most probably been a change of gender. The claim of P. is justified to

21 The text reading is: *avia dakkhiṇāmāsaāṇi bhavissanti,* repeated by the Vidūṣaka on p. 6 of the text.

a certain extent, but it is undeniable that P. considerably overshoots the mark.

Page 27. (*Line* 23.) The propriety of assuming a Loc. Sing. Fem. in *-āaṁ* is questionable ; we should sooner assume an unauthorized Sanskritism.—(*Line* 27.) *vīṇā* Cāru. 79 has been correctly construed in the Chāyā as Nom.; Printz has been apparently misled by the text reading *vādāanti*, which is only a misprint for *vādīanti*, duly corrected in the second edition (p. 97).—(*Line* 32.) There is no need to correct *Ujjaïṇīo* to *Ujjaïṇīe* in Svapna. 21, 22 (first ed. pp. 20, 21), since *Ujjaïṇīo* is not Gen. Sing. but a nominal adj. (=*Ujjayinīka-* or *Ujjayinīya-*) derived from Ujjayinī ; P. has again allowed himself to be misled by the Chāyā.

Page 30. (*Line* 2.) P. has misunderstood the passage cited by him ; the subject of *bhavissadi* is *uvāaṇaṁ* and not *tāṇi*, which is the predicate !—(*Line* 3.) *tāṇi* Svapna. 33 is not Acc. Plu. Masc. but Nom. Plu. Neut. (see above).—(*Line* 35.) It is uncertain whether *imāṇi* Pratijñā. 46 should be regarded as Masc. or Neut., since *māsaāṇi* Cāru. 5, 6 has been used once as Nom. Plu. (see above).

Page 31, *lines* 28-31. Ś. *saṭṭhī*, *sattamī* and *aṭṭhamī* refer to the *day* of the lunar month, and not to the *hour* of the day; cf. *aṭṭhamī khu ajja* Cāru. 53. Further *kālaṭṭhamī* Pratijñā. 50 is not the 'black eighth hour,' but the eighth day of the dark fortnight of Śrāvaṇa when Kṛṣṇa was born, a day also known as Kṛṣṇāṣṭamī.

Page 34, *line* 27. The text reading *vādāanti* Cāru. 79 is only a misprint, as already remarked, for *vādīanti*, corrected in the second edition. The sign of the medial *ī* was displaced and knocked off by the superior Devanāgarī figure 4. The Chāyā correctly renders it as *vādyante*, a fact which should have put P. on the right track.

Page 35, *line* 36. It is not quite clear to me what P. means by future forms with thematic *-i-*, unless he is referring to forms like *ukkaṇṭhissidi* Svapna. 17, *jivissidi* Dūtagh. 54. The Turfan fragments have preserved *pavvajissiti* (Lüders 48, footnote 1).

Page 36, *line* 23. No need to correct *pucchīadi* to *pacchīadi*, if the sentence is understood aright ; see Belloni-Filippi, Note

critiche ed esegetiche al "Cārudatta" di Bhāsa, *Riv. studi orient.* 9, 586.

Page 41, *line* 16. In explaining *āamia* Pratijñā. 11 as Abs. of rt. *gam*, P. follows the Chāyā, and has been misled again; for by reading the passage himself, he could have seen that *āgamya* in that context does not make any sense; here *āamia* is obviously =*ācamya*, *ācamana* being a ceremony which always precedes the praṇāma. The stage direction *ācamya* is particularly frequent in these plays.

Page 44. (*Line* 11.) Ś. *āma* occurs in the Bṛhatkathāślokasaṁgraha 5.114 and 9.70, as pointed out by Winternitz, *Ostasiat. Zeitsch.* 9, 290, and in Mattavilāsa.—(Line 19.) Ś. *uvaṇhāṇa* Avi. 79, to judge by the context, is not 'Waschwasser,' but some other accessory of the bath, perhaps ointment.—(*Line* 26.) The reference for *kumbhavaḷāa* has been left out inadvertently.

Page 45. (*Line* 2.) If *tuṇṇiā* is the same as *tuṇhīā* of the second edition (p. 21) it will hardly be necessary to assume the improbable meaning 'Schwiegertochter' for an imaginary word *tuṇṇiā*, since *tuṇhīā* is a regular derivative of Skt. *tūṣṇīkā* 'silent,' which gives a thoroughly satisfactory sense; see my translation (Oxford University Press 1923), p. 21. —(*Line* 4.) The successive steps by which *pankhu* Bāla. 14 is reached appear to be these: Skt. *pāṁsu*> Pkt. *pāṁṣu*,[22] *pāṁkhu*, *paṁkhu*; whether the form is valid and admissible is another question; about the meaning, however, there can not be any doubt; see Weller, *Die Abenteuer des Knaben Krischna*, Anmerkungen, p. 94 —(*Line* 7.) Instead of correcting *vaḍivassaa*- Cāru. 1, 4 to *paḍivassaa*- (as suggested by P.), adopt the reading of ms. kha, *paḍivessa*- (Skt. *prativeśya*-) Cāru. 4 footnote. —(*Line* 13.) Ś. *paḍisarā* is, as Ganapati Sastri in his commentary to the second edition of the Pratijñā. explains, a charmed protective thread worn round the arm (*hastadhāryaṁ rakṣāsūtram*); in support he quotes Keśava: *pratisaras tu syād hastasūtre nṛṣaṇḍayoḥ* /...*vraṇaśuddhau ca kecit tu striyāṁ pratisarāṁ viduḥ* //.—(*Line* 21.) For Ś. *laṇḍuo*, see now Morgenstierne, *Ueber das Verhältnis zwischen Cāru. u. Mṛccha.* p. 27 f., who has undoubtedly proposed a very satisfactory explana-

22 Wackernagel, *Altind. Gramm.* 1 § 118.

tion.—(*Line* 22.) For *lohi* also see Morgenstierne, op. cit. p. 26, who refers to a Divyāvadāna passage cited by Monier-Williams. —(*Line* 24.) Both the form and meaning of *honti*- Svapna. 59 are quite clear. The Chāyā rightly explains it as *huṇkṛti*; *honti*= *huṁ-ti* for *hum iti*, lit. 'huṁ'- making, that is, following the narrative with the ejaculation 'huṁ', in order to show continued attention; see my transl. (O.U.P.) p. 57 and explanatory note 26. Cf. the analogous derivatives *jhaṭ-iti*, *taḍ-iti*, and see examples in Kāśikā to Pāṇini 6. 1. 98. See also now Belloni-Filippi, *Riv studi orient.* 10, 370.

We will now revert to p. 5 of the thesis, where Printz has presented in a collected form the most important peculiarities of the Prakrit of these dramas, which establish, according to him (p. 47), the antiquity of the dramas, as also in a remote manner the authorship of Bhāsa. In regard to these alleged peculiarities,[23] I have to submit the following remarks and reservations: (1) *metta*- (*mātra*-) according to P. is later than *matta*-. It may be so. But matta- is mentioned by grammarians like Hemacandra and occurs in the Kalyāṇas. also. It cannot therefore be said to be peculiar to the Trivandrum plays. (2) Svarabhakti *u* in *purusa*- is correct in Śaur. according to Mārkaṇḍeya. (3) -*puruva*- (instead of -*puvva*- Skt. -*pūrva*-) ifc. is found in the Turfan Fragments, and may therefore be regarded as a genuine archaism. (4) The regular cerebralization of *l* is a characteristic of Malayalam mss., also found in most of the southern editions of classical dramas recently published; it is not a peculiarity of the Trivandrum plays. (5) In the hesitation between the reflexes -*ṇṇ*- and -*ññ*- (Turfan-*ññ*-) of -*jñ*- I see a confusion between the Śaur. and Māg. forms, an explanation which harmonises with the frequent representation of -*ny*- by -*ṇṇ*- (the Turfan mss. show -*ññ*-). (6) The alleged change of -*dy*-(in *ud-y*-) and -*ry*- to -*yy*- is un-

23 See also W. E. Clark, *JAOS*. 44, 101 f.—Clark takes exception to my use of the term 'archaism,' but there can be, I think, no question that the forms mentioned by me are 'archaic'; that is to say they belong to the 'Old Prakrit' in contradistinction to the rest of the Prakrit of the dramas, which is mostly 'Middle Prakrit.' That is exactly the sense in which I use the word 'archaic.'

certain, since the symbol used in southern mss. to represent the ligature is ambiguous. These doubts are only strengthened by the inconsequent treatment of initial *y*-. (7) The change of *-kṣ-* to *-kkh-* instead of *-cch-* signifies nothing relative to the age of the plays. (8) Some of the instances of Acc. Plu. Masc. ending in *-āṇi* cited by P. are valid ; others are doubtful or spurious. (9) Nom. Acc. Plu. Neut. in *-āṇi* appears to be a common, if not the regular, form in Malayalam mss. (10) The Loc. Sing. Fem. ending in *-āaṁ*, as well as *attāṇaṁ* (for *attāṇaaṁ*), I regard as Sanskritisms, as there is no authority for them anywhere else. (11) *vaaṁ*, *amhāaṁ*, *tava*, and *kissa* are true archaisms, as they are documented by actual instances in the Turfan Fragments. But it appears now that they are not peculiar to the Trivandrum plays, since they are also found in other Malayalam mss. of, in part, very late plays such as the Mattavilāsa, Nāgānanda and others. (12) *kocci* I am unable to account for. (13) In view of the *geṇh-* of the Turfan fragments, *gaṇhadi* appears to be a misformation, a hybrid Tadbhava. (14) The Part. Pres. Pass. in *-īamāṇa-*, I am inclined to regard with suspicion. (15) As has been observed by P. and other writers, these mss. contain clear instances of the inhibition of simplification of double consonants and compensation lengthening. Malayalam mss. in general, as appears from text editions of dramas published in recent years, favour this inhibition. (16) *karia* and *gacchia* are true archaisms ; but *āamia* should be deleted from the list, since it is a reflex not of *āgamya* but of *ācamya*. (17) The use of *mā* with Imp., Inf. or Abs. and the employment of Part. Perf. Pass. as nomen actionis are matters of style and have no bearing on the question of the age of the plays.

The more important of the general observations regarding the Prakrit of these plays scattered through the above pages may be conveniently summarized as follows. Firstly, even if these plays be Bhāsa dramas (or as some scholars think adaptations of Bhāsa dramas), the Prakrit they contain is not necessarily *Bhāsa's* Prakrit, since our mss. are barely 300 years old. Secondly, owing to faulty classification Printz's citations of Māg. and Ardham. forms are useless for purposes of dialect differentiation. Thirdly,

we cannot be sure that forms like *matta* (*mātra*), *purusa* (*puruṣa*), *eva* are archaic, or even legitimate Prakrit forms, unless we find corroboration from more reliable sources; they may be mere Sanskritisms. Fourthly, the treatment of the ligatures *jñ*, *ny*, *ry* in our mss. is confused and inconsequent; hence in regard partly to the near possibility of confusion between Śaur. and Māg. forms, and partly to the ambiguity of the symbol representing the ligature *jj*-*yy*, Printz's attempt to bring the treatment of these conjuncts in a line with their treatment in the Turfan fragments and to base thereon chronological conclusions regarding the stage of development of Bhāsa's Prakrit may be regarded as having signally failed. Fifthly, the most important contribution to the subject made by Printz is to have shown that the mss. of our plays contain some instances of the Acc. Plu. *Masc.* ending in -*āṇi*, though the instances are not quite as numerous as Printz supposes them to be. Sixthly, besides this noteworthy form the mss. contain a few more instances of genuine Prakrit archaisms; but as these latter are met with also in Malayalam mss. of classical dramas and of even later southern productions, the Prakrit argument is in conclusive and cannot by itself be safely made the basis of chronology. Seventhly and lastly, a satisfactory solution of the Bhāsa question cannot be reached from a study merely of the Prakrits of the plays.

July, 1924.

THE OBLIQUE FORM AND THE DATIVE SUFFIX *-S* IN MARĀṬHĪ

BY N. B. DIVATIA

SIR GEORGE GRIERSON'S notice of Jules Bloch's work (*La formation de la langue marathe*) in *JRAS.* 1921 has proved to me highly suggestive and profitable. I shall state how. His remarks regarding the Marāṭhī oblique singular form (*devā-*) are of special value to me. He accounts for *devā-* by the Apabhraṁśa genitive *devaha.* This view is supported by the fact that the genitive sense fits in very well with forms like *devā pāśī*, *devā kaḍe*, *devā-lā*, and the like. In the last-named form the dative suffix *-lā*, as has been pointed out by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar,[1] is traceable to Hindī *lāya*, *liye*, Sindhī *lāya* etc.; e.g. *devake liye*, *deva-je lāya*, and the like. The genitive *devā-cā* will present a sort of tautology in *devasya*>*devaha*+*cā* (from Skr. *-tya*, which itself is equivalent to a genitive suffix by virtue of its adjectival nature) But such apparent tautology is occasionally met with in later Apabhraṁśa formations like *tāsa-taṇa* (Skt. **tasya-tana*) and we may very well condone it.[2]

It may be incidentally remarked that Sir R. G. Bhandarkar[3] also regards this oblique form ending in *-ā* as derived from the Apabhraṁśa genitive in *-ha.* This derivation of the oblique form, however, throws special light on the formations in the sister language Gujarātī. Thus, while Marāṭhī has the oblique modification *-ā* in the case of words ending in *-a* (*deva* type), Gujarātī has a similar oblique form in *-ā* in the case of words ending in *-o*

---

1 *Wilson Philological Lectures*, p. 249.

2 e.g. तासु तणइ पुत्त बुद्धिमंत (*Jambu-svāmi-rāsa*, V. S. 1266); नामइ लीधइ जास तणइ (*Vidyā-vilāsa-rāsa*, V.S. 1486).

In fact Hem. VIII. iv. 422 has (inside it) संबन्धिन: केरतणौ where the suffixes are adjectival and take a genitive before them. Only when their true nature had been lost sight of and the two suffixes became mere genitive terminations, the preceding genitive terminations vanished.

3 op. cit. p. 239 f.

(*ghoḍo* type) ; e.g. *ghoḍā-pāse, ghoḍāthī, ghoḍānuṁ*, and the like. (The genitive here also will present a double suffixing, *-ha-* and *-nuṁ*.) And here I come to the point where I have derived special light from Sir George's article under reference. Hitherto I have been viewing this *-ā* in a different light. To quote myself :—

" A closer analysis of the ओ stem will show that the word ending in ओ is really the form of nominative singular and it is by a constant habit, as it were, that it has taken the place of a base-word. For just see. घोडो turns the final ओ into आ in its inflectional forms : घोडाने, घोडाथी, घोडानुं, घोडामां. घोटकः (Skr.), घोडउ (Pr.), घोडो (G.) :—here the कः becomes उ through the elision of क् and the change of अः into उ, thus retaining the nominative termination inherently. Before ने, थी, etc. it is not the अउ or ओ that is changed to आ; but the true phonetic course is : घोटक—घोडअ + ने, थी etc. and thus the अअ (without the nominative termination) becomes आ (घोडाने etc.)."[4]

The *-o* stem in Guj., the *-ā* stem in Mar. and Hindī, have been shown by me at p. 215 of the same book thus :—

अउ (Masc. ending Apabhr.)
घोडउ

ओ (G.)
घोडो[5]

आ (M.)
घोडा

आ (H.)
घोडा

औ (H., Old H., or Braj H.)
घोडौ

In the view stated above, I am now half inclined to introduce a partial modification regarding the oblique ending *-ā*, and accept its derivation from the Apabhraṁśa genitive in *-ha*. There are only two points requiring consideration :—

(*a*) If the oblique ending is derived from the Apabhr. genitive, we shall have the stems with the *-ka-* suffix for the

---

[4] *Gujarātī Language and Literature* by N. B. Divatia, p. 216.

[5] The final ओ in घोडो is what I call अर्धविवृत (semi-wide).

nominative singular (*ghoṭakaḥ*,> *ghoḍaü*> *ghoḍo*), while for the oblique cases we must take the words without the *-ká-* suffix (*ghoṭasya*> *ghoḍaha*> *ghoḍā*+*nuṁ*, *ne*, *māṁ* etc.) This double arrangement presents a radical defect.

(*b*) In the case of the ablative (*ghoḍāthī*) the genitive ancestry (*ghoḍaha-*) in the oblique form (*ghoḍā-*) does not fit properly with the origin of the termination *-thī*, which I trace from the conjunctive participle of *thā* (Skt. *sthā*), गामथी आव्यो being equivalent to गाम थईने आव्यो.[6] This presents a psychological defect not easily cured.

Being faced by these two objections, the strength of which cannot be ignored, I hesitate to accept the genitive theory. The *a-a* theory (*ghoṭaka-*> *ghoḍaa-*> *ghoḍā-*+the oblique terminations) would get over both the difficulties, while furnishing a fairly satisfactory account of the *ā*-ending of the oblique form. Thus, I feel inclined to go back to my original view, not without a feeling of diffidence all the same.

There is another question discussed by Sir George Grierson which also furnishes food for reflection. It is as regards the *-s* in the Marāṭhī dative (*devās*). Sir George Grierson gives up his derivation of this *-s* from the Prakrit genitive suffix[7] *-ssa*, and accepts M. Bloch's view which, following Mr. Rajvade, sees in the *-s* the Old Marāṭhī dative termination *-sī* (*devāsī*); but (and here I am afraid he treads on doubtful ground) he traces this *-sī* again to the genitive *-ssa* plus the locative *-e*, 'false locative' though he calls it. The reasons he advances present, no doubt, a plausible and compact structure wherein the Prakrit genitive is fitted in snugly to account for the oblique form as well as this dative suffix. But, I may be permitted to suggest, we can do without resorting to the doubtful handle of a 'false locative' and double case-ending, if we derive this dative suffix *-s* (Old Marāṭhī *-sī*) from Skt. *samam* 'with.' No doubt, the sense furni-

---

[6] See my article on "The Ablative Termination in Gujarātī" in *Sir Ashutosh Mukerji Jubilee Volumes*, No. 3 (Orientalia), part 3.

[7] Beames, *Comparative Grammar*, vol. 2, p. 237, § 52 seems to have derived this *-s* from the Skt. genitive suffix *-sya*.

shed by *samam* will primarily be instrumental, and such is the sense in Marāṭhī in sentences like मीं गोपाळाशीं बोलत नाहीं, एकमेकाशीं त्यांचा तंटा आहे: But these very instances will furnish the psychological step by which the dative sense quietly comes in. In fact Sir R. G. Bhandarkar has shown this aspect of the *-s* suffix fully, in his *Wilson Philological Lectures* (pp. 250—252). I need not reproduce the whole discussion, but the following extract (p. 252) will be useful :

"Now the original sense of this word [viz. *samam*] is *with*, but this *with* expresses many relations, the differences between which become wider in the course of time and thus the word सम has come to signify '*to, according to, with* (as an instrument) and *from*.' "

The only point wherein I differ respectfully from my learned Master in that discussion is regarding the derivation of *-seṁ* or *sauṁ* as an ablative suffix. In इतना वचन ब्राह्मणके मुखसें(सौं) निकला, Dr. Bhandarkar traces the ablative endings to *samam* just as in the case of the instrumental[8] and dative suffix. I think these ablative endings *-seṁ, -sauṁ* can be derived better from some obsolete or posited conjunctive participle of the Skt. root *as* (='to be,' as in Mar. *asūn*) ; this derivation fits better with the participial sense contained in Guj. *-thī* (=*thaī*).[9]

September, 1921.

---

[8] Hindī has another instrumental suffix, *sana*, e.g.

मोसन कौन भिरइ योधा वद (Tulsī's Rāmāyaṇa, Laṅkā-kāṇḍa)

हमसन सत्य मर्म सब कहहु (ibid. Bāla-kāṇḍa).

This *sana* can very well be traced to Skt. *sanga*, rather than to *samam*.

[9] For further details see my article in *Sir Ashutosh Mukerji Jubilee Volumes*, No. 3, part 3, referred to in n. 6 *supra*.

THE PORTUGUESE ALLIANCE WITH THE MUHAMMADAN KINGDOMS OF THE DECCAN

By Rev. H. Heras, S.J.

St. Xavier's College, Bombay

(*Communicated by Rev. Dr. R. Zimmermann, S.J.*)

Commenting on a letter of Fr. Jerome Xavier, S.J., published in the *Indian Antiquary*, February 1924, I pointed out the probability of an alliance between the Portuguese Viceroy and the Muhamimadan Kings of the Deccan, although the *Asia Portuguesa* of Manuel de Faria y Sousa and other works on this subject do not say a word about this particular point.[1] The only hint of such an alliance is found in Fr. Du Jarric, *Thesaurus Rerum Indicarum*, vol. III, p. 46.

Fortunately in the official Archives [2] of the Portuguese State of India, at Pangim, I came across last October several documents which clearly speak of this alliance. I shall publish here the extracts from those documents, chronologically arranged.

I

From a letter of Philip II of Spain to the Viceroy Dom Francisco de Gama, Conde de Vidigueira, dated Lisbon, 25th of February 1596.

" Matias de Alburquerque [the former Viceroy] wrote me also that his embassy to the Idalcao [the King of Bijapur] was intended to make an alliance with the Mellique [the petty Chief of Chaul and Dabul] in order to be ready against the Mughal [Emperor] ; and to attain better this object, he mentioned to him many reasons showing him the evident danger for all those kings of ruining themselves altogether, should they not ally and strengthen themselves against

[1] Intentionally, I do not mention Danvers, *The Portuguese in India*, because his work is nothing but a translation of the above-mentioned *Asia Portuguesa*.

[2] *Archivo da Secretaria Geral do Governo.*

the Mughals; to this you must help also, persuading all those kings one after another, a task that will become easier with the Mellique at present, since peace has already being settled [with him], according to the news of Matias de Alburquerque that came by land."[3]—Vide *Monções do Reino*, No. 4, Ano de 1595 té 1598, fol. 629.

II

In another letter, dated Lisbon, 5th of February 1597, the same King recommends again to the same Viceroy the aforesaid alliance with all the neighbouring Kings against the Mughals.—Vide *Monções de Reino*, No. 4, Ano de 1595 té 1598, fol. 783.

III

In an answer from the Viceroy to the King, of the same year, there is an account of the steps taken by the King of Bijapur to foster this alliance.—Vide *Monções de Reino*, No. 4, Ano de 1595 té 1598, fol. 785.

IV

From a letter of Philip III of Spain to the same Viceroy, dated Lisbon, 21st of November 1598.

"I approve of your interest in keeping the King of Bijapur on good terms with that state, although he ordered no visit to be paid to you until now, as is customary. Treat him always remembering how necessary is the alliance with the neighbouring kings, to defend us all against the Mughal [Emperor]."[4]—Vide *Monções do Reino*, No. 2, Ano de 1583 té 1601, fol. 421.

---

[3] "Tambem me escreue Matias dalburquerque q a sua embaixada ao Idalcão fora p. ajuntarse em amisade com o Mellique pera se defenderem do Mogor, e pera q milhor viesem nisto lhe acreçentara m. resões mostrandolhe o uidente periguo em q estauão de se perderem de todo si se não ligasem e fisesem poderosos contra o Mogor e q de uos ap. deveis ir persuadindo a hũ Rei, e a outro, e agora se podera faser iso milhor com o Mellique pois são asentadas as pases com elle comforme a o auiso de Matias dalburquerque q ueio por terra."

[4] "Bem he que facieis conta, de oydalxá Correr Bem Com esse estado, Postoque não Vos mandasse, até então Visitar Como he Costume, e que corrães com ele nas Lembranças necessarias do muito que ymporta ligarsse com os Reys Vezinhos, e defenderemse todos do Mogor."

V

From a letter of Philip III of Spain to the Viceroy Ayres de Saldanha, dated Lisbon, 25th of January 1601.

" And though the Conde [de Vidigueira] writes me that Akbar is already an old man, distrusting his eldest son and fearing to be poisoned by him and [on account of that] he had stopped the war he was waging against the kingdom of the Mellique ; yet since that King is very powerful and sagacious and desirous of approaching to that island of Goa, I recommend you to keep your eyes open on his designs and intentions to prevent them with the necessary remedies."[5]—Vide *Monções do Reino,* No. 8, Ano de 1601 té 1602, fol. 18.

VI

From a letter of the same King to the same Viceroy, dated Valladolid, in Spain, 23rd of March 1604.

" The circumstances of the relations between Akbar and his eldest son, as related by you, are the most suitable for the welfare of that state ; and since we know the purpose of that King, I wish that the discord between them would last until his death, for after his demise it is understood that war will ensue in all his kingdoms. The precautions taken by the Mellique to defend himself from him, as you told me, must be much appreciated, and I thank you for the pains that you tell me you are taking to induce and incite him to do so." [6]—Vide *Monções do Reino,* No. 9, Ano de 1604, fol. 22.

---

[5] " E posto que o Comde me escreue que ho equebar é ja velho e andaua desconfiado de seu fº mais velho e temia que o matase com peçonha e que tinha sospensa a guerra q fazia ao Rno do Melique, por este Rey ser muito poderoso e sagaz e desiyar muito avezinharse a essa ilha de Goa, vos encomendo tenhães sempre muita vegra em seus desegnhos e intentos pera lhos altalhardes com hos Remedios necessarios."

[6] " O estado em q dizeis q esta o Ecabar com seu filho mais velho he o q mais conué a esse estado conforme aos intentos deste Rey querera Ds q em quanto uiuir continue esta diuizão entre elles, que por sua morte bem se entende q auora em todos seus Reinos. As deligencias q me auizães q o Melique faz por se defender delle se deuem estimar muito, e eu uos agradeço as que me escreueis q fazeis pello pressuadir e animar a isto."

From a study of these extracts we can deduce the following conclusions :

1st.—The Portuguese authorities were aware of the imperialistic designs of Akbar, and the King of Portugal himself was the first in urging the Viceroy to be ready for the Mughal attack.

2nd.—The best preparation against the Mughal army seemed a defensive alliance with the neighbouring kingdoms ; such were the Muhammadan kingdoms of the Deccan that surrounded Goa. Akbar could never reach the Portuguese settlement but by passing through these kingdoms, since he would never dare to fight the Portuguese on the sea.

3rd.—Although these documents inform us only of the negotiations between the Portuguese and the King of Bijapur and the Mellique, nevertheless there is no doubt that all the other kingdoms of the Deccan joined this alliance to which they were invited by the very Portuguese, and it seems probable that this invitation was made through the above-mentioned Kings of Bijapur and Dabul.

4th.—During the time of the rebellion of Prince Salim against his father the alliance was a little forgotten, being then unnecessary : as the interior disturbances of Akbar's kingdom became a cause of rejoicing for his enemies.

At last the Portuguese saw all those kingdoms overcome by the Mughal Emperors, being themselves safe in the midst of that storm, on account of the new Maratha kingdom that arose from their ruins.

June, 1924.

THE BHĀSA RIDDLE: A PROPOSED SOLUTION

By V. S. Sukthankar

The previous history[1] of the discussion centering round the thirteen anonymous dramas discovered by Pandit Ganapati Sastri and attributed by him to Bhāsa is sufficiently well known, and there is no need to repeat it here in detail. It will suffice to observe that many distinguished scholars, whose researches in Sanskrit literature entitle them to speak with authority, fully agree with the learned editor of the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, and wholeheartedly support him in attributing these plays to Bhāsa. The theory has not however won entire satisfaction. Prominent among the dissenters are: Ramavatara Sarma Pandeya, Barnett, Bhattanatha Svamin, Rangacarya Raddi, Kane, and (latterly also) Pisharoti, who all agree in placing the dramas after the seventh century A. D., and in regarding them as the work of some paltry playwright or playwrights. Between these extremes lie the views of Winternitz and myself. We accepted the Bhāsa theory, but not without some reserve; while recognizing that the propounder and the supporters of the hypothesis had a strong *prima facie* case, we held at the same time that the evidence adduced did not amount to a conclusive proof (see, above, vol. 26, p. 232).

* * *

One peculiarity of the Bhāsa problem appears not to have been clearly realized by most previous writers on the subject. This peculiarity is that there is not a single argument advanced on *either* side that may be regarded as conclusive and that has not been, or cannot be, met by an almost equally sound argument on the opposite side.

Let us consider some individual instances. Take the fact that the title of the work and the name of the author are not mentioned

[1] Bibliographical material will be found in my " Studies in Bhāsa (V)", above vol. 26, pp. 230 ff.

JBBRAS. 1925.

in the rudimentary sthāpanā of these plays. This omission is explained by the supporters of the theory on the assumption that in pre-classical times details like these were left to the preliminaries and are therefore not found in the sthāpanā.[2] The explanation possesses a certain degree of probability, but nothing more since it involves an unsupported and unproved, though plausible, assumption.—On the other hand those writers who deny the authorship of Bhāsa explain the omission on the ground that the plagiarists or adapters, whose handiworks these dramas are, had very obvious reasons to remain nameless, an assumption, on the face of it, not less improbable than the other.[3]

Next take the lack of accord with the rules of theorists like Bharata, as seen in the admittance, into our plays, of stage fights and death scenes, which were avoided in the classical drama, and are in part expressly forbidden by Bharata. This has been utilized by the protagonists of the theory as another proof of the antiquity of the plays. But this explanation, like the previous one, has all the appearance of being another subtle attempt at exploiting our ignorance of pre-classical technique, being in the last analysis nothing more nor less than a deduction from the *a priori* assumption that the plays in dispute are pre-classical. The Mahābhāṣya passage enlisted by Keith (*The Skt. Drama*, p. 110) in this connection does not in any way countenance the assumption; for Weber's theory of mimic killing of Kaṁsa and mimic binding of Bali, which has repeatedly been shown to be inadequate, must, unfortunately, be finally abandoned now, after the conclusive proofs brought forward by Prof. Lüders[4] to show that the Śaubhikas and the Granthikas were both merely raconteurs or rhapsodes.—The conflict with the rules of treatises on rhetorics admits of another explanation, which must be pronounced to be quite as plausible as the former, if not still more so. These innovations, it has been urged, have been introduced in quite recent times with a view to producing a more arresting stage effect, to striking a more popular note in the presentation of Sanskrit plays; and there is ample evidence to show that these plays have indeed been very popular, as stage

[2] Keith, *The Sanskrit Drama* (Oxford 1924), p. 111.

[3] Pisharoti, *BSOS*. 3, 115.

[4] " Die Śaubhikas," *SBAW*. 1916, 698 ff.

plays, in Malayalam, where some of them are even now regularly produced by professional, hereditary actors, locally known as Cākyārs and Naṅgyārs (Pisharoti, *BSOS*. 3, 112 f.)

Then there is the argument based on similarities in diction and ideas between these plays and some celebrated plays such as Śakuntalā. These similarities are clearly equivocal. While they can on the one hand be used[5] to prove that the striking ideas of the author of the anonymous plays have been freely borrowed and amplified by others, they can on the other hand be also used, with equal cogency, to support the view that the anonymous compilers of these plays have found in the works of classical dramatists a splendid hunting ground for *bons mots* and happy thoughts.[6] And the protagonists of the theory have to admit that no strict proof of indebtedness is possible. Keith (op. cit. p. 124) confidently assures us that " the evidence is sufficient to induce conviction to any one accustomed to weighing literary evidence of borrowing." Yes, but what is the test of one's being " accustomed to weighing literary evidence of borowing" ? Presumably, the suceptibility to the conviction being induced !

Then there are verses in these dramas that are found cited or criticized in different treatises on rhetorics. They have been used by those who favour the Bhāsa theory to corroborate their view that these are works of a very considerable writer, who could be no other than Bhāsa. The rhetoricians being mostly silent on the point, we do not know that the verses quoted were taken from dramas by Bhāsa. It cannot however be denied that the view can claim for itself a certain degree of plausibility.---On the other hand it is also not quite impossible that these verses might have been appropriated for their own use by adapters at a moment when the creative faculty, being too severely taxed, had refused to function further.

Great capital has been made by the opponents of the theory out of certain verses which are cited as Bhāsa's in anthologies of Sanskrit verse, but are not found in the present plays.[7] The ar-

[5] See for instance Ganapati Sastri in the Introduction to his edition of SV.

[6] Cf. Raja in *Zeitschr. f. Ind. u. Iran.* (*ZII.*) 2, 260.

[7] Cf. Ramavatara Sarma Pandeya, *Śāradā*, vol. 1, p. 7.

gument is not as sound as it at first sight appears. It is easy to explain their absence on the hypothesis that the supposed author had written further plays or poems which may be the sources of these citations (Keith, op. cit. p. 105). And if that does not suffice it may, with some plausibility, be urged that these verses have been excerpted from some lost recensions of these dramas. We need only recall the well-known fact that in the third act of the Bengali recension of Śakuntalā one scene is four or five times as long as the corresponding portion in the Devanāgarī recension; even the names of the *dramatis personae* are in part different in the two recensions.[8] As a last resort one may even enlist the unquestionable facts that in these anthologies the names of authors are frequently misquoted, the same verse is attributed to different authors, and finally verses attributed even to Kālidāsa and other celebrated dramatists are not found in their extant works.

I have so far dealt with some of the minor arguments advanced on either side and tried to show that they are utterly inconclusive. There are however some arguments that are considered by their propounders as decisive in character, and to these we shall now turn our attention.

One of these arguments is that our plays are begun by the Sūtradhāra, in contradistinction to the classical plays, and that this characteristic of the plays by Bhāsa has been pointedly alluded to by Bāṇa in the distich in which he celebrates the great dramatist. This argument on which the supporters of the theory place so much reliance is *doubly* fallacious, and the great effort made to find in this fact a proof conclusive of the authorship of Bhāsa must definitely be pronounced a failure. The verse from the Harṣacarita states merely that Bhāsa's dramas were begun by the Sūtradhāra. It is the perversion of all probability to find in this innocuous statement a *distinguishing* characteristic of Bhāsa dramas, because every Sanskrit play we know of, all the dramas by Kālidāsa, Harṣa, Bhavabhūti and other dramatists, were likewise begun by the Sūtradhāra. The latter fact is somewhat obscured by the circumstance that instead of the correct shorter formula *nāndyante*

---

[8] Śakuntalā ed. Monier Williams (Oxford 1876), Preface, p. vii.

sūtradhāraḥ, some northern manuscripts read:

nāndyante tataḥ praviśati sūtradhāraḥ,

these words being placed between the benedictory verse (or verses) with which all dramatic manuscripts begin, and the introductory prose speech of the Sūtradhāra. When the stage direction reads merely *nāndyante sūtradhāraḥ*, there is no question that the Sūtradhāra does *not* enter at the point where this stage direction is inserted, and must be supposed to be on the stage already, for the simple reason that the manuscripts contain no stage direction announcing his entry. Who recites the nāndī follows from the direction of the Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata (Ed. Kāvyamālā, adh. 5, v. 98):

sūtradhāraḥ paṭhet tatra madhyamaṁ svaram āśritaḥ nāndīm...

In view of this clear statement of Bharata, can we legitimately draw any conclusion other than that the nāndī of the classical dramas was recited by the Sūtradhāra himself? Thus, according to the testimony of the vast majority of manuscripts and conformably to the rules of rhetoricians, the procedure is that the Sūtradhāra first recites the benedictory stanzas (with which manuscripts of all dramas commence) and then proceeds with the prose speech assigned to his role. The words *nāndyante sūtradhāraḥ* of the northern manuscripts then mean: "at the end of the nāndī the Sūtradhāra (continues speaking)". This is the view of the commentator Jagaddhara,[9] and it appears to be perfectly sound. If it is admitted that all plays without exception were begun by the Sūtradhāra with the recitation of benedictory stanzas, it is clear that the position and the wording of the first stage direction has nothing whatsoever to do with the question whether the play is begun by the stage-director or not. The only difference between the manuscripts of the Trivandrum plays and the *northern* manuscripts of classical plays is as regards nomenclature, as has been already pointed out by Winternitz (*Ostasiat. Zeitschr.* 9, 285). Such being the case, it cannot any longer be maintained that Bāṇa had the intention of drawing attention to any distinguishing characteristic of Bhāsa's

[9] Mālatīmādhava, Ed. Bombay Skt. Series, p. 6.

works by saying that his plays were *sūtradhārakṛtārambha*. Bāṇa's only object is, as Keith (op. cit. p. 91) has justly remarked, "to celebrate Bhāsa's fame, and to show his wit by the comparison in the same words with some not very obvious object of comparison." Bāṇa's verse is merely a subhāṣita, as will now be admitted by every unbiased critic. The discussion whether in this verse from the Harṣacarita there is an allusion to some technical innovation of Bhāsa in shortening the preliminaries, combining the functions of the Sūtradhāra and the Sthāpaka, taking the prologue away from the Sthāpaka and placing it in the mouth of the Sūtradhāra and much other vague speculation of the kind (Lindenau, *Bhāsa-Studien*, pp. 10,37) is mere verbiage. The Trivandrum plays at any rate offer no occasion for the discussion of these questions and, what is more important, furnish no answers to them.

Our conclusions on this point may be summarized thus: (1) the nāndī, which used to precede all dramatic representations, being invariably recited by the Sūtradhāra, all Sanskrit dramas are *sūtradhārakṛtārambha;* (2) it is thus wholly inadmissible to regard this attribute as specifying a distinguishing characteristic of Bhāsa's dramas; and therefore (3) the argument which seeks in the position and the wording, in our manuscripts, of the stage direction *nāndyante* etc. a proof conclusive of Bhāsa's authorship is utterly devoid of cogency. Furthermore, it has now been shown that all Malayalam manuscripts of dramas begin in the identical manner. If it then still be true (as Keith asserts, *Ind. Ant.* 1923,60) that "by this decidedly noteworthy fact" (namely, that these plays are begun by the Sūtradhāra,) they are "eligible to be considered Bhāsa's", then all Sanskrit dramas are likewise eligible to be considered Bhāsa's!

Several efforts have been made to prove in these dramas traces of later date than Kālidāsa; but most of the arguments,[10] as has in part already been shown, are quite inadequate to support the conclusion. It is also impossible to find cogency in the argument advanced first—to my knowledge—by Kane,[11] and then repeated recently by Barnett[12] that the Nyāyaśāstra of Medhātithi men-

[10] For instance, Pisharoti, *BSOS.* 3, 107 f.

[11] *Vividha-jñāna-vistāra*, vol. 51 (1920), p. 100.

[12] *BSOS.* 3, 35.

tioned in the Pratimā is the same as the Manubhāṣya by Medhātithi (*c.* 10th century). The different śāstras have been mentioned in the Pratimā (v. 8/9) in the following order: the Mānavīya Dharmaśāstra, the Māheśvara Yogaśāstra, the Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra, Medhātithi's Nyāyaśāstra and lastly the Prācetasa Śrāddhakalpa. If the view mentioned above be right, we should, in the first place, be unable to explain satisfactorily why the Nyāyaśāstra of Medhātithi should be separated from the Dharmaśāstra of Manu; then there is the difficulty that the Manubhāṣya is, strictly speaking, neither a work on Nyāya (Logic) nor a śāstra (Keith, *BSOS.* 3,295). More important than these is in my opinion the following consideration. There is something so incongruous in citing Medhātithi's commentary on Manu in juxtaposition with such śāstras as the Dharma, Yoga, and Artha, and the Śrāddhakalpa, said in this passage to be proclaimed by gods and progenitors of the human race like Manu, Maheśvara, Bṛhaspati, and Pracetas, that, to say the least, the explanation cannot be considered very happy. In fact the context compels the conclusion that the Nyāyaśāstra is a science of the same order as the other śāstras mentioned in the list, and that Medhātithi is an author, real or imaginary, of the same standing as the rest of the authorities mentioned by Rāvaṇa. Whether such a work as Medhātithi's Nyāyaśāstra (or at least some notice of it) has come down to us or not seems to me immaterial. Moreover the boast of Rāvaṇa, the primeval giant, that he has studied Medhātithi's commentary on Manu would be such a ludicrous anachronism that we must refuse to credit even an alleged plagiarist of the tenth or eleventh century with such an abysmal absurdity. The only effect of admitting such an explanation of the Nyāyaśāstra would be to make the enumeration and the whole boast of Rāvaṇa farcical, which is far from being the desired effect. It is thus impossible to accept the identification of the Medhātithi of the Pratimā with the commentator on the Manusmṛti.

Now finally the Prakrit argument. At one time I myself held the view that the archaisms in the Prakrit of these plays would throw some light on their age; but my anticipations have not been realized. It has now been shown that in Malayalam manuscripts of dramas of even Kālidāsa and Harṣa we come across archaisms

of the type which are claimed to be peculiar to the Prakrit of the dramas in dispute : most of these alleged peculiarities recur moreover in dramas by southern writers of the sixth and later centuries (Pisharoti, *BSOS.* 3,109). It should seem that the Prakrit of the dramas is a factor depending more on the provenance and the age of manuscripts than on the provenance and the age of the dramatist. In the course of a lengthy review of *Bhāsa's Prākrit* (1921) by Printz, published elsewhere, I have expressed it as my opinion that the Prakrit archaisms cannot by themselves be safely made the basis of chronology, and that a satisfactory solution of the Bhāsa question cannot be reached from a study of the Prakrit alone (above, pp. 103 ff.). With ponderous dogmatism Keith insists that "there being evidence of Bhāsa's popularity"—strictly speaking, only of the plays attributed to Bhāsa—"with the actors in Malayalam, it is only necessary to suppose that they modified the Prakrit of the later plays in some measure to accord with the Prakrit of Bhāsa" (Keith, *BSOS.* 3, 296). The explanation would have value if, and only if, all the plays in dispute could on independent evidence be confidently attributed to Bhāsa ; but such is not the case. Keith's argument only begs the question.

* * *

However desirable it may be to obtain a decisive answer to the main question in the affirmative or negative, it is quite clear that neither of the solutions proposed will stand critical investigation. The problem appears to be much more complex than hitherto generally supposed. As is only too often the case, the claims of both sides seem to be only partial truths : in a sense these plays—at least some of them, at present quite an indeterminate number—are Bhāsa's plays and in a sense they are not.

That they are not original dramas seems to follow with sufficient certainty from the absence of the name of any author in both the prologue of the dramas and the colophon of the manuscripts. The explanation that in pre-classical times the name of the author was not mentioned in the prologue of the plays involves a gratuitous assumption wholly lacking proof. Further no satisfactory explanation has so far been offered by those who regard all these dramas as Bhāsa's why the name of the author should not have been

preserved in the colophon of a single manuscript of even one of these thirteen dramas. The Turfan manuscript of one of Aśvaghoṣa's dramas[13] has preserved intact the colophon of the last act, recording the fact that the drama is the Śāriputraprakaraṇa by Aśvaghoṣa. It cannot, therefore, with any plausibility, be urged that the colophons of the oldest manuscripts of dramas did not contain the title of the work or the name of the author; and it would be demanding too much from probability to expect the wholesale and accidental destruction of the colophons of all manuscripts of a group of thirteen dramas by one and the same author.

The true character of these plays was partly recognized by Rangacarya Raddi and by two Malayalam scholars A.K. and K.R. Pisharoti. The main thesis of Raddi [14] was a negative one; it was to prove that the plays could *not* be by Bhāsa; and the whole of his lengthy article on the subject comprises practically of a destructive criticism of the arguments of Ganapati Sastri. He does not however lose sight of the "possibility that these plays may be abridged versions of the original dramas by Bhāsa, prepared by some modern poet or other." The Pisharotis also look upon these dramas as compilations, regarding moreover the Trivandrum SV. as "an adaptation of the original Svapnavāsavadatta of Bhāsa." The two scholars were not able to support their claims on more solid ground than that there is a living tradition, preserved in the circle of Malayalam Pandits, to the effect that these "plays are only compilations and adaptations" (Pisharoti, *BSOS.* 3,116; compare Raja, *ZII.* 1923, 264). But a substantial basis for this assumption has now been supplied by Sylvain Lévi's discovery of certain references to Bhāsa's SV. in yet unpublished manuscripts of two treatises on rhetorics.

In a notice of these manuscripts Lévi (*JA.* 1923, 197—217) publishes certain information which throws more light on this perplexing question than anything else that has recently been written on the subject; but Lévi appears not to have realized the full significance of his discovery, unless indeed I have misunderstood him, which is easily possible. In the article cited above Lévi

---

[13] *SBAW.* 1911, 388 ff.

[14] *Vividha-jñāna-vistāra*, vol. 47 (1916), pp. 209 ff.

draws attention to the mention of the SV. and the Daridracārudatta, as also to certain quotations from these dramas in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa (ND.) by Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, and the Nāṭakalakṣaṇa (NL.) by Sāgaranandin. One of these quotations differs in a very important particular from all quotations so far adduced. We have found verses from our dramas cited and criticized in works on rhetorics but without any mention of the source; we have seen verses cited in anthologies over the name of Bhāsa, but without mention of the work in which they occur; we have lastly found verses quoted as from a SV., but without specification of the author. Either the name of the author or that of the work, connected with the verse cited, has hitherto been invariably in doubt; sometimes both have been in doubt. Now for the first time we have some datum which connects a verse with Bhāsa as also with a specific drama by him; the verse is cited in the ND. with the specific remark that it is excerpted from the SV. by Bhāsa. From the fact that this verse is not found in our play, Lévi concludes that the latter is not the 'authentic' SV. by Bhāsa (*JA*. 1923, 199).

Let us first make it clear to ourselves what is the exact meaning of the little word 'unauthentic' with which we are asked to condemn the drama. Are our editions of the works of Kālidāsa authentic in the same sense as our editions of the works of, say, Goethe? Are they authentic in the sense that the text they present is the text exactly as conceived and finally written down by the reputed author? No one will be prepared to deny that the Prakrit of the dramas may have been gradually modernized in the course of transmission, or that the Sanskrit portion may have suffered a little at the hands of well-meaning 'diaskeuasts,' or that lastly some few verses and even scenes may have been interpolated or omitted. As has already been remarked, a scene in the third act of the Bengali recension of Śakuntalā is four or five times as long as the corresponding part in the Devanāgarī version. The play Vikramorvaśī has come down to us in two recensions, of which one contains a series of Apabhraṁśa verses that are entirely ignored in the other. Such being the case, what is the justification for considering even one of the shorter versions, which are apparently older than the other, in every detail an exact replica of the original in the form in which it left the hands of the dra-

matist who composed it? It seems certain that the tradition fluctuated, and fluctuated at times considerably.[15] Still we do not make such a bustle over the fact that 'authentic' works of Kālidāsa are no longer available.

Be that as it may, there is another aspect of this citation that appears to have a positive value. The verse reads:

pādākrāntāni puṣpāṇi soṣma cedaṁ śilāsanam
nūnaṁ kācid ihāsīnā māṁ dṛṣṭvā sahasā natā
(Read *gatā*.)

The king of Vatsa, regarding a stone bench in the pleasure garden, says:

"The flowers are trodden under feet,
The stone bench retains still its heat.
Forsooth some lady who was seated here,
On seeing me, has departed in haste."

Commenting on this verse Lévi remarks that we find in the Trivandrum SV. 'dislocated' elements of the scene as written by Bhāsa. Such is however not the case. There is no dislocation at all. All that may have happened is that the ND. verse has dropped out of the text of the Trivandrum version.

The situation in our play is this. In the first scene of the fourth act Padmāvatī and Vāsavadattā are promenading in the pleasure garden, admiring the beauty of śephālikā bushes in blossom. Padmāvatī's maid begs her to seat herself on a stone bench in or near the śephālikā bower, and she herself departs to pluck flowers. The ladies seat themselves on the bench indicated and indulge in a tête-à-tête. Presently Padmāvatī, to her consternation, discovers that the King and the Jester are strolling leisurely in the direction of their arbour. She thereupon proposes to her friend that they themselves should move away and hide in a neighbouring jessamine pergola. The King and the Jester approach the śephālikā arbour just vacated by the

[15] Compare Sten Konow, *Das indische Drama*, p. 66: "Jetzt sind wohl die meisten der Ansicht, dass keine der uns vorliegenden Rezensionen den Urtext des Dichters [*viz.* Kālidāsa] repraesentiert."

ladies. At this point there is in our play a small hiatus, all but imperceptible. Standing near the bower the Jester abruptly remarks: "Her Ladyship Padmāvatī must have come here and gone away." We fail to understand why the Jester should make this curious, unmotivated remark. The missing link is evidently the ND. stanza, which furnishes the requisite motive for the remark of the Jester. We are here told that the King, on observing that the surface of the stone bench is warm, surmises that some lady who had been sitting there, on seeing him approach, had hurriedly departed, crushing under her feet, during a hasty retreat, the flowers lying scattered on the ground. The King has no idea who that lady was. But the observation of the King sets the Jester thinking, who shrewdly surmises that it must have been Padmāvatī.

This recapitulation of the situation should make it clear to the reader that there is no great 'dislocation' of the elements of the original scene as far as it may be surmised from the quotation in the ND. All that is needed to restore the text is the replacement of the new verse at the point where there is a hiatus in our version.

In the same article Lévi has another quotation which also has some bearing on the present question. The other treatise, the Nāṭakalakṣaṇa, gives, without any mention of the name of the author, an extract from a SV. to illustrate a device with which the transition from the preliminaries to the main action of the play is achieved and a character is introduced. The quotation is:

nepathye sūtradhāraḥ utsāraṇāṁ śrutvā paṭhati /aye kathaṁ tapovane 'py utsāraṇā /(vilokya) kathaṁ mantrī Yaugandharāyaṇaḥ Vatsarājasya rājyapratyānayanaṁ kartukāmaḥ Padmāvatīyajanenotsāryate / /

"The stage director (sūtradhāra) on hearing the order for dispersal shouted behind the scenes repeats: 'How now! Even in a hermitage people are being ordered to disperse.' (Looking aside.) 'Why, the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa, who is seeking to restore to the King of Vatsa his kingdom, is being turned away by the servants of Padmāvatī.'"

It is extremely unfortunate that the name of the author of the play has not been mentioned in the NL. The omission, depriving us of certainty, leaves us to surmise that the author is Bhāsa; but the conclusion is inevitable unless indeed we postulate the existence of three Svapnavāsavadattās, parallel to the three Kumārasambhavas, now famous in the history of Sanskrit literature!

The prologue of the SV. cited by the author of the NL. is evidently worded differently from ours. The elements revealed by the extract are these: there is a stage director, and a dispersal (utsāraṇā) of the crowd behind the scenes (nepathye). The stage director hears the orders shouted out by the servants of Padmāvatī, and sees the crowd being dispersed. In that crowd he notices Yaugandharāyaṇa, who is there to carry out his plans for the restoration of the King of Vatsa. The same elements are present in our play. Here the stage director, on hearing the noise behind the scenes, announces that he will go and find out the cause of the commotion, which he does. Behind the scenes is shouted out the order for dispersal (utsāraṇā). The stage director thereupon explains to the audience that the servants of Padmāvatī are dispersing the crowd of hermits. We observe the repetition of the identical word utsāraṇā, and the similarities between the exclamations of the stage director in the extract and of Yaugandharāyaṇa in the Trivandrum version:

SUTRADHARA (NL.)	YAUGANDHARAYANA (TRIV.)
aye kathaṁ tapovane 'py utsāraṇā /	*katham ihāpy utsāryate /*

Consequently on the evidence of these two extracts, of which one is expressly stated to be from the SV. by Bhāsa, and the other is presumably from the same source, we may safely assume that though the Trivandrum play is not identical with the drama known to Rāmacandra and Sāgaranandin in the 12th century, it does not differ from the latter very considerably: the two are near enough to each other to be styled different recensions of the drama by Bhāsa. My own surmise is that the Trivandrum Svapnavāsavadattā is an abridgement of Bhāsa's drama, with a different prologue and epilogue, adapted to the Malayalam stage.

* * *

Here follows a summary of the important conclusions arrived at above, to which are added certain auxiliary observations on the character of the present group of plays.

Vitally important are the following facts relating to these plays, which will throw a deal of light on the subject and which may not be ignored in any future investigation of the question, namely, that these plays form a part of the repertoire of a class of hereditary actors in the Kerala country; that the manuscripts of these plays are by no means rare, though they apparently are the jealous preserve of these actors; and lastly that the latter produce these dramas sometimes as a whole, and sometimes in detached and disconnected parts. Cf. Pisharoti, *BSOS.* 3,112 f; Raja, *ZII.*1923, 250 f.

The circumstance that these plays have been traditionally handed down without any mention of the name of the author, whether in the prologue of the plays or the colophon of the manuscripts, is an almost plain indication that they are abridgements or adaptations made for the stage, and they have in fact been regularly used as stage-plays in Malayalam.

These plays show admittedly many similarities, verbal, structural, stylistic and ideological, which suggest common authorship. But in the absence of more information as to the originals, of which these are evidently adaptations, it would be unsafe to dogmatize and postulate, at this stage, a common authorship.

The coincidences in formal technique are almost certainly to be explained as due to the activity of adapters. It has been already pointed out that the professional actors who produce these plays often stage only single acts selected from these plays; and it is reported that in passing from one act of some one drama to another act of a different drama, these actors are in the habit of prefixing—quite naturally, it seems to me—to each act an appropriate introduction consisting of a benedictory stanza and a short prose speech or dialogue announcing the character that is about to enter as well as the business. Our prologues appear to be such introductions, which thus owe their similarity merely to a peculiarity of local histrionic technique. The preliminary benedictory stanzas, which

are condemned on all hands as bad verses, have all the appearance of being also the handiwork of these adapters; the short formal bharatavākya seems likewise to be a sort of a formulistic epilogue. It would be a mistake to see in these external coincidences a proof of common authorship of the plays. In order to ascertain whether two or more of these dramas are by the same hand we shall have therefore to employ some other tests, which have not so far been used by any previous writer on this subject. The speculation regarding the identity of the rājasiṁha of the epilogues (Konow, op. cit. p. 51) is wholly without meaning; the expression seems to have been left intentionally vague so that the same stanza could be conveniently used on any occasion and at the court of any king. Significant is the similarity between our epilogues and the hemistich from the MBh. (12. 321. 134):

ya imāṁ pṛthivīṁ kṛtsnām ekacchatrāṁ praśāsti ha,

to which I have drawn attention elsewhere (*JAOS.* 41, 117).

The Prakrit archaisms have no probative value for the antiquity or the authorship of the dramas. It is, however, not impossible that some of the plays may have preserved, so to say in fossilized condition, a few really archaic forms inherited from the old prototypes. Of this character seem to be the Prakrit accusative plural masculines in *-āṇi*, noted first by Printz (*Bhāsa's Prākrit,* pp. 3, 26; but see above, p. 111).

Similarly the metrical portions of the dramas appear to have preserved some epic usages (*JAOS.* 41, 107 ff.) It seems impossible to believe that a dramatist who normally wrote good Sanskrit could not produce verses grammatically more correct than the following:

smarāmy avantyā 'dhipateḥ sutāyāḥ (SV. v. 5)
jñāyatāṁ kasya putreti (Bāla. ii. 11)
strīgatāṁ pṛcchase katham (Pañca. ii. 48), or
āpṛccha putrakṛtakān (Pratimā. v. 11)

As regards the stage fights and the representation of a death on the stage in these plays, a plausible explanation is that they are, as suggested by K. R. Pisharoti (*BSOS.* 3, 113), comparatively

modern innovations introduced with a view to producing a more striking stage effect. But it is still an open question whether some of these elements may not be survivals derived from an older dramatic technique. This reservation does not hold good, however, in the case of a *final* death scene. The practice of these dramas can form no exception to the general rule prohibiting a final catastrophe; the Ūrubhaṅga is not intended to be a tragedy in one act. It is the only surviving *intermediate* act of an epic drama. This follows from the fact that the play has no epilogue, in which particular it resembles the Dūtaghaṭotkaca, which in one of its manuscripts, as reported by Pisharoti (*The Shama'a*, 4 (1924),19), is actually and rightly called Dūtaghaṭotkacāṅka. Some slight confirmation of this surmise we find further in the report of C. R. Raja (*ZII*. 1923, 254) that there is extant in Malabar a dramatized version of the Rāmāyaṇa in 21 acts ! Even apart from that, there is no doubt that any spectacular representation ending in a death, whether of the villain or of the hero, would be repugnant to Hindu taste, and foreign to Hindu genius,—unless it be an apotheosis, a canonization of the hero as in the Nāgānanda.

The verse *Bhāsanāṭakacakre 'pi* etc., said to be a quotation from the Sūktimuktāvali of Rājaśekhara, proves by itself little or nothing for Bhāsa's authorship of Svapnavāsavadattā, since the authenticity of the former work and quotation is open to criticism. It is not generally known that the preceding verses make out that Bhāsa was not only a contemporary of Harṣa (evidently Harṣa Śīlāditya of Thanesvar) but also a washerman by caste and the real author of the triad, Ratnāvali, Nāgānanda, and Priyadarśikā, a statement which we have every reason to discredit. That the Pre-Kālidāsian Bhāsa did write a Svapnavāsavadattā follows, however, with tolerable certainty from the evidence of the ND. by Rāma candra (*JA*. 1923, 197–217).

The more important reasons for regarding our SV. as closely related to Bhāsa's drama of that name are these. To start with there are the name, and the style, as also the merits of the play, which has won general recognition as a work of high order. The rhetorician Vāmana cites a stanza which not only occurs in our play but fits evidently well in the context. It contains scenes compat-

ible, with those suggested by the quotations from Bhāsa's drama cited in rhetorical treatises by Rāmacandra, Sāgaranandin, as also by Śāradātanaya (cf. Ganapati Sastri, *JRAS.* 1924, 668). From the second of these it follows that Bhāsa's drama opened like ours with the entry of Yaugandharāyaṇa (accompanied probably by Vāsavadattā) followed by that of Padmāvatī and her retinue.—From Śāradātanaya's summary it would appear that some scenes are wanting in our version.—The Dhvanyālokalocana cites apparently a lost verse, *svañcitapakṣma* ° etc. It is a mistake to argue that this verse cannot have a place in our play. Even if it does refer to Vāsavadattā, as it appears to do, it may be easily included in a reminiscence of the King.—The statement of Sarvānanda remains, for the time being, unexplained, unless we are prepared to adopt the emendation suggested by Ganapati Sastri, which, it must be admitted, is an *a priori* solution of the difficulty.

There is some reason to believe that the SV. and the Pratijñā are by the same author. In the concluding act of the SV., it will be recalled, there is an allusion to the fact that in the nuptial rites celebrated at Ujjayinī after the elopement of Vāsavadattā, the parties to be united in wedlock were represented merely by their portraits. There is no reference to this marriage "by proxy" in the Kathāsaritsāgara nor in the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī, and therefore there was probably no reference to it in the Bṛhatkathā either; it appears to be a free invention of the dramatist. It forms, however, an important element in the dénouement of our SV; it is therefore significant that there is a clear allusion to it in the concluding act of the Pratijñā. also.

As regards the Cārudatta I have seen no reason to abandon my former view (*JAOS.* 42, 59 ff.) that our fragment is probably the original of the first four acts of the Mṛcchakaṭika; but if it is not that, it is suggested, it has preserved a great deal of the original upon which the Mṛcchakaṭika is based. My conclusions are only strengthened by Morgenstierne's independent study of the relations between the two plays. From references in one of the new Sāhitya works utilized by Lévi it follows that a drama called Daridracārudatta was known to the author of this treatise; the Mṛcchakaṭika is named separately; which shows that they were two

different dramas ; both of them had however evidently the same theme. The Daridracārudatta had at least nine acts, and the two plays developed to the end on very similar lines. The rhetorician does not tell us anything about the author; so its authorship is still uncertain.

My view of this group of plays may then be briefly summarized as follows. Our Svapnavāsavadattā is a Malayalam recension of Bhāsa's drama of that name ; the Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa may be by the same author ; but the authorship of the rest of the dramas must be said to be still quite uncertain. It may be added that Bhāsa's authorship of some particular drama or dramas of this group is a question wholly independent of the homogeneity or heterogeneity of the group as a whole. Indeed the only factor which unites these plays into a group is that they form part of the repertoire of a class of hereditary actors. The Cārudatta is the original of the Mṛcchakaṭika. The five one-act Mahābhārata pieces form a closely related, homogeneous group ; they appear in fact to be single acts detached from a lengthy dramatized version of the complete MBh. saga,—a version which may yet come to light, if a search is made for it. The Ūru-bhaṅga is *not* a tragedy in one act, but a detached intermediate act of some drama. The present prologues and epilogues of our plays are all unauthentic and comparatively modern.

November, 1924.

THE DATE OF THE BHĀGAVATA PURĀṆA

By C. V. Vaidya, M.A., LL.B.

The Bhagavata is generally considered to belong to the 12th century A.D. (Macdonell, *Hist. Skt. Lit.* p. 302). Wilson in the preface to his translation of the Viṣṇu Purāṇa probably first suggested this date on the ground that the reputed author of the Purāṇa (though the repute is denied by most orthodox Pandits) was Bopadeva, a contemporary of Hemādri, who was minister to a Yādava king of Devagiri. The orthodox view, as stated at length in a recent Marāṭhī book, is that the Purāṇa belongs to a much older date and may be looked upon as composed by Vyāsa himself. Although we need not accept this second view, it seems to me on many grounds that the Bhāgavata Purāṇa may be placed somewhere in the 10th century A.D., being posterior, to state it definitely, to Śaṅkara who lived in the beginning of the 9th century A.D., and anterior to Jayadeva, the author of the Gītagovinda, who lived in the time of Lakṣmaṇasena of Bengal (1164 A.D.).

It is unnecessary to enter here into the question whether this Vaiṣṇava Bhāgavata is one of the 18 Mahā-Purāṇas composed by Vyāsa or whether it is outside the number, although this question has been discussed by orthodox Pandits in a number of Sanskrit works and at great length. It cannot be stated how the canard arose that the Purāṇa was not composed by Vyāsa but by Bopadeva. But the refutation of the story has given wider publicity to it and, in spite of the refutation, many people still believe that Bopadeva is the real author of the Purāṇa. No doubt the beginning of the Bhāgavata distinctly states that Vyāsa composed this Purāṇa, because even after composing all his other works he remained unsatisfied for the reason that he had not sufficiently sung the praise of Govinda. This suggests that the present Bhāgavata is not included in the 18 Mahā-Purāṇas but the 12th Skanda enumerates these 18 Purāṇas and includes this Bhāgavata among them; so that, as stated in the Padma, Vyāsa felt dissatisfied

after he had written the other 17 Purāṇas. The Matsya Purāṇa (Chap. 53) gives the 18 Purāṇas with their lengths and says :

यत्राधिकृत्य गायत्रीं वर्ण्यते धर्मविस्तरः ।
वृत्रासुरवधो यत्र तद्भागवतमुच्यते ॥

The first line does not apply to this Vaiṣṇava Bhāgavata, though the second does. We do not know if this description applies to the Devī Bhāgavata which claims to be one of the 18 Mahā-Purāṇas instead of this Bhāgavata. In this state of things we may ignore the question whether the present Bhāgavata is one of the 18 Purāṇas or not. Whether the work is composed by Vyāsa or not does not lead us to any definite conclusion as to its date. For Vyāsa, as composer of Purāṇas, is an elusive entity; and the Purāṇas, as they exist, are so loose, ungrammatical and unpoetical that they scarcely can be said to be all the compositions of any one great poet, not to speak of Vyāsa. The Bhāgavata, on the other hand, does seem to be the composition of one author, who was a great poet and a philosopher; and the work deserves the fame and the favour it enjoys. Its language, however, is not old though it is forcible. It is often difficult and even abstruse. The poet has introduced here and there kūṭas (riddle words), following the kūṭas interspersed in the Mahābhārata by Vyāsa or Sauti; but they are not pleasing and happy like the latter. The language of the Bhāgavata clearly, therefore, belongs to a time when Sanskrit was not spoken even by Pandits; and, being correct, may be ascribed to a grammarian of later days like Bopadeva. Yet that this Bhāgavata cannot be ascribed to Bopadeva of the 12th century A.D. will appear clear from the considerations which we set forth in this paper. It may be added that the Bhāgavata is not only a highly poetical and philosophical work, it appears to be the work of one author. The diction is the same throughout; the manner of running into longer Vṛttas is the same and the exposition or theory is the same. There may be some interpolations, but they are very few and far between, unlike those in the other Purāṇas. Indeed there are supposed to be 332 Adhyāyas in the Bhāgavata as stated in the Padma Purāṇa, and Śrīdhara has commented on 335 only. These three additional chapters are also pointed out. Hence it may be

stated that the present Bhāgavata is the least tampered with Purāṇa we have and thus there is no difficulty in relying upon arguments drawn from an internal study of the Purāṇa as in other Purāṇas; for with regard to the latter one is never certain, when relying upon any extract from them, as to whether these extracts do belong to the original Purāṇas or whether they are interpolations.

With these introductory remarks we proceed to detail the arguments drawn from an internal study of the Purāṇa which go to prove that the Purāṇa does not belong to the 12th century A.D., but is about two centuries earlier in date.

The first and the foremost argument is that the Bhāgavata, though it sings the loves of the Gopīs and Kṛṣṇa, does not mention even once Rādhā, the chief of his Gopī mistresses. This is no doubt a negative argument but we think that the mention of Rādhā in the Bhāgavata was imperative if the cult of Rādhā had come into existence at the date of the Purāṇa. The history of that cult may be given shortly as follows.

The Gopīs were in the Mahābhārata mere devout worshippers of Śrīkṛṣṇa. As the philosophy of devotion to God developed, it was likened to the intense love of an adulteress for a paramour. The Gopīs, therefore, in time, were transformed from devout devotees into ardent adulteresses. Most legends, as Gibbon has well shown, grow in this very way; what is originally rhetoric becomes logic by and by. In the Harivaṁśa, the Gopīs are represented as adulteresses. But there is no mention yet of Rādhā, though there is a description therein of the Rāsa or love-dance of Gopīs and Kṛṣṇa. The Vāyu and the Matsya Purāṇas contain no mention of Rādhā, nor does the Viṣṇu Purāṇa. The only Purāṇa which mentions her is, so far as we have ascertained, the Padma Purāṇa and therein the mention is probably an interpolation, if the whole Purāṇa is not later than the Bhāgavata. In course of time, the story of many unnamed Gopīs was bound to give rise to the legend of a particular Gopī who was most loved by Kṛṣṇa. Human frailty cannot rest satisfied with the story of the loves of innumerable unnamed Gopīs for Kṛṣṇa. And the legend of Rādhā

naturally arose. The Bhāgavata, which poetically describes the love of Gopīs, could not have avoided mentioning Rādhā if the Rādhā cult had come into existence when its gifted author composed it. We know that the Gītagovinda of Jayadeva is based on the love of Rādhā for Kṛṣṇa and as its date is well known (*ca.* 1164 A.D.) we may be sure that the Bhāgavata came into existence long before the Gītagovinda. Jayadeva and Bopadeva were nearly contemporaries and hence it seems extremely probable that Bopadeva is *not* the author of the Bhāgavata.

Later development of the Rādhā cult may be noticed. Rādhā subsequently became a wife of Kṛṣṇa. Her father's name is given as Vṛṣabhānu, a name mentioned in the Padma Purāṇa. There is even a date assigned to her birth by the Padma Purāṇa (भाद्रमासि सिताष्टम्यां सा जाता राधिका दिवा[1]), which directs a Rādhāṣṭamī-vrata to be observed by devout Vaiṣṇavas. Finally Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa became symbols for the human and the divine souls. Even the Gopīs became in later tradition Śrutis (Vedic verses), which were born as human beings for love of God Kṛṣṇa. This transcendental explanation of the loves of Gopīs (and of Rādhā) had no existence yet in the days of the Bhāgavata. The explanation which this Purāṇa gives is more simple and straightforward. Parīkṣit directly asks the question: "If the doings of incarnated gods are to serve us as models, how is it that Kṛṣṇa indulged in guilty amours with Gopīs, who were wives of other men?" Śuka answers: "Indeed the conduct of Kṛṣṇa was blamable. But the *words*, not the actions, of great men should be our guide. Great men sometimes do things which only they may do. We should always do what is declared by them to be proper" (vv. 28-32, Chap. 33, Skandha 10). It seems thus that the Bhāgavata was written at a time when the amorous conduct of Kṛṣṇa was still looked upon as not fit for mortals to copy; nor had that conduct assumed a transcendental aspect. The Bhāgavata, indeed, was compelled to describe the loves of Gopīs and Kṛṣṇa as they were commonly then believed in, and by its power of high imagination and graceful diction has enshrined these scenes in melodious tones and enchanting imagery.

---

1 Brahma Khaṇḍa, Chap. 7.

Yet it does not seek to hide their objectionable nature. It seems, therefore, probable that the Bhāgavata must have preceded the Gītagovinda by a considerable interval of time.

The lower limit for the composition of the Bhāgavata is afforded, on the other hand, by the fact that it treats Buddha as an avatāra of Viṣṇu. The inclusion of Buddha among the incarnations of Viṣṇu is a remarkable phenomenon in the development of modern Hinduism and we shall have to discuss it in detail elsewhere. But here it is sufficient to remark that this could not have happened till after a long time after Śaṅkara whose efforts following those of Kumārila gave the final blow to Buddhism in India. Hindu preachers were strongly hostile to Buddha all along and it could be only after the final overthrow of Buddhism and the inclusion of the Buddhists after conversion among Vaiṣṇavites (who were probably less hostile to them than others) owing to their also professing and practising Ahiṁsā, that Buddha could have begun to be looked upon as an incarnation of Viṣṇu. The several stages in the gradual development of this idea may also be noticed. In the Mahābhārata (about 3rd century B.C. according to my view) Buddha is not mentioned though his tenets are. In the Rāmāyaṇa (1st century B.C.) Buddha is distinctly called a thief.[2] In the Vāyu and Matsya Purāṇas, so far as I can see, there is no mention of him. Later on in the Viṣṇu he is mentioned not as an incarnation of Viṣṇu but as a "false semblance" of his, sent to delude the Daityas. He is called Mahāmoha and is represented as taking the form first of Jina and then of Buddha. He is first described as taking the form of Arhatas and preaching on the banks of the Narmadā the doctrine of Syādvāda ("it may be so and it may not be so") a reference, which is historically important, to the peculiar argument used by Jain Pandits in refutation of their opponents' views. He is then said to have put on red garments and taking the name of Buddha to have preached Nirvāṇa and Vijñāna (Book 3, Chap. 38, Wilson's Transl.). This phase is one which preceded that in the Bhāgavata. Here Buddha and Jina are confounded and the author seems to know not much

---

[2] Ayodhyā Kāṇḍa यथा हि चोरः स तथा हि बुद्धः ॥

of either. In peoples' view Buddha seems by this time to have become an incarnation of Viṣṇu. Still the objectionable nature of his preaching seems to have been remembered and the description given in the Bhāgavata[3] of this incarnation is as follows:

ततः कलौ सम्प्रवृत्ते सम्मोहाय सुरद्विषाम् ।
बुद्धो नाम्ना जिनसुतो कीकटेषु भविष्यति ॥

Kīkaṭa is Magadha, and Buddha here is certainly the same person who preached in Magadha, though here he is confounded with Jina or Mahāvīra the founder of the Jain religion. The idea here is that Viṣṇu incarnated himself as Buddha (or Jina) and deluding the Asuras prevented them from performing Vedic sacrifices which would have secured to them merit and power. The same idea is repeated in the Bhāgavata wherever the incarnations of Viṣṇu are detailed as in Skandha 2 and in Skandha 11:

देवद्विषां निगमवर्त्मनि धिष्ठितानाम्,
वादैर्विमोहयति यज्ञकृतोऽतदर्हान्.

Evidently the Bhāgavata, though it stands for Ahiṁsā, is not against Vedic sacrifices involving slaughter. In fact it distinctly states that slaughter in Vedic sacrifices is not slaughter or hiṁsā : तथा पशोरालभनं न हिंसा.

The Vaiṣṇavism of the Bhāgavata, though allied to Buddhism or Ahiṁsā, is still in favour of Vedic sacrifices. The further stage is reached in the Gītagovinda of Jayadeva, who first looks upon the incarnations of Viṣṇu as ten only and describes the 9th incarnation, Buddha, in the following verse:

निन्दसि यज्ञविधेरहह श्रुतिजातम् ।
सदयहृदयदर्शितपशुघातम् ।
केशव धृतबुद्धशरीर जय जगदीश हरे ॥
—Gītagovinda, Chap. 1.

Here there is distinct praise of Buddha for showing compassion to animals through kindness of heart. In later times still, Vedic sacrifices involving animal slaughter were almost forgotten. More-

[3] Skandha 1, Chap. 2.

over the incarnation of Buddha has now lost almost all reference to the Buddha who preached against the Vedas and their animal sacrifices and has come to mean that Viṣṇu has become motionless and senseless in this Kali age. These various stages in the development of peoples' sentiments towards Buddha and the position which the Bhāgavata occupies in this respect shows distinctly that the Purāṇa must have been composed after Śaṅkara and before Jayadeva and thus may be looked upon as belonging to the 10th century A.D.

This inference is supported by the attitude of the Bhāgavata towards the Sāṅkhya philosophy and its author Kapila. This philosophy has enjoyed favour or disfavour with orthodox Pandits of the Hindu religion at different times, and we may trace these ups and downs clearly from their writings. Originally the Sāṅkhya philosophy was acceptable, since its tenets were not openly at variance with orthodox Vedic views. Kapila was honoured greatly as the founder of an impressive philosophy with its attractive theory of the gradual evolution of the world and its still more alluring category of the three guṇas regulating all the diverse activities, physical, mental and moral in this world. Thus we find the Bhagavadgītā praising the Sāṅkhya philosophy (*vide* सांख्ये कृतान्ते), taking up and elaborately working out the three Guṇas and treating Kapila, the founder of the philosophy, as a Vibhūti of God among Siddhas or those who had obtained salvation (सिद्धानां कपिलो मुनिः). Even in the Mahābhārata generally the tenets of the Sāṅkhya philosophy are stated at length over and over again, though its belief in dualism and the plurality of souls is noted with a little disfavour. When, however, thereafter the Vedānta philosophy was clearly formulated by the Vedānta Sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa with its peculiar chief tenets (viz. belief in monism and the universal pervading of one soul), the Sāṅkhya philosophy came to be its principal opponent and it has been specially and at length refuted therein. The Sāṅkhya philosophy became consequently an unorthodox philosophy hereafter (*ca.* 1st century B. C.). Moreover its Nirīśvara-vāda was then clearly seen, although the Mahābhārata had tried to correct it by adding a 26th tattva, viz. God: and it remained a philosophy without God for a long time.

Śaṅkara, when writing his famous commentary on the Vedānta Sūtras, naturally looked upon it in the same position, and treating it as the Pradhāna Malla or the chief opponent, levelled all his intellectual force against it. Kapila, its founder, though not an actual incarnation of Viṣṇu, was, as we have seen, according to the Gītā, a Vibhūti of God ; and he must have often been looked upon even as an incarnation, when the theory of incarnations grew. But Śaṅkara could not treat him so, he being the founder of an unorthodox refuted philosophy. Consequently, in one place he distinctly states that the Kapila, who is sometimes looked upon as an incarnation of Viṣṇu, is a different person from the founder of the Sāṅkhya philosophy :

या तु श्रुतिः कपिलस्य ज्ञानातिशयं प्रदर्शयन्ती प्रदर्शिता न तया श्रुतिविरुद्धमपि कापिलं मतं श्रद्धातुं शक्यम् । कपिलमिति शब्दसामान्यमात्रत्वात् । अन्यस्य च कपिलस्य सगरपुत्राणां प्रतप्तुर्वासुदेवनाम्नः स्मरणात् ॥[4]

It seems that after this condemnation of the Sāṅkhya system and some of its unorthodox tattvas, such as mahat, etc., by Śaṅkara, an attempt was made to remedy these defects and we know that the Sāṅkhya Sūtras which exist to-day and which plainly belong to about the 14th century A.D. represent the Sāṅkhya philosophy as seśvara or "with God" and try to identify the mahat-tattva with Hiraṇyagarbha of the orthodox philosophy. The Bhāgavata clearly makes this attempt and it may be taken to set the way to the making of the Sāṅkhya philosophy an orthodox one. We find the Sāṅkhya doctrine explained in detail in several places in the Bhāgavata and chiefly in Skandha 11, which is the most important and the most readable of the twelve Skandhas of the Bhāgavata and which has been introduced much in the same way and for the same purpose as the Śāntiparva in the Mahābhārata. In Chapter 25, the Sāṅkhya philosophy is detailed with its tattvas made consistent with the Vaiṣṇava philosophy of the Bhāgavata and in Chapter 26 the diversity caused by the 3 guṇas is detailed with a fourth category (viz. the nirguṇa or guṇātīta) added and identified with Viṣṇu and his devotees. The Bhaga-

[4] Bhāṣya of Śaṅkara on Sūtra 1, Adhyāya 2, Vedānta Sūtra.

vadgītā chapter on the guṇas is here repeated with suitable and interesting changes and additions. In short the exposition of the Sāṅkhya tenets made here and in other places in the Bhāgavata seems to have been a development subsequent to the Bhāṣya of Śaṅkara. Kapila again is now a regular incarnation of Viṣṇu and the founder of the Sāṅkhya system. In the first Skandha where twenty-two incarnations of Viṣṇu are detailed, the fifth is said to be Kapila who taught the tattvas of his philosophy to Āsuri:

पञ्चमः कपिलो नाम सिद्धेशः कालविप्लुतम् ।
प्रोवाचासुरये सांख्यं तत्वग्रामविनिर्णयम् ॥

Nay, in Skandha 9, where the story of Sagara's sons is detailed and wherein they are described as being burnt to ashes by fire issuing from the opened eyes of Kapila disturbed in his meditation, this Kapila is said to be the same as the founder of the Sāṅkhya philosophy: यस्येरिता सांख्यमयी दृढेह नौः (9. 8. 14.)

This is in clear opposition to the statement of Śaṅkara and shows that Śaṅkara must have preached and written before this popular Bhāgavata came into existence.

The theory of incarnations propounded by the Bhāgavata is again in opposition to the modern theory, though not as distinctly as the above. The Bhāgavata preaches that there were 22 avatāras of Viṣṇu (in another place they are said to be 24). The present orthodox belief is that there are only ten avatāras and Buddha is the 9th of them, Kapila and others being omitted. The present view must have grown after the Bhāgavata and is contained in the song quoted before from Jayadeva. In the Gītagovinda Jayadeva details only 10 avatāras and in the order in which they are now believed in. Although it may be suggested that these ten are chief ones while the others are minor ones, we may derive some support from the larger number of incarnations given in the Bhāgavata to the inference that the Bhāgavata preceded the Gītagovinda by a century or so. Śaṅkara further refutes the view that Kapila, the founder of the Sāṅkhya system of philosophy, was an incarnation and seems, therefore, to precede the Bhāgavata. It would be very interesting to trace the gradual development of the theory of the avatāras of Viṣṇu through the

several Purāṇas and to see which include Kapila among them. The Mahābhārata gives ten avatāras of Viṣṇu, and neither Buddha nor Kapila is included therein. In the Ramāyana (1.40.25), where the story of the burning of the sons of Sagara is given, Kapila is no doubt said to be Vāsudeva but he is not spoken of there as the founder of the Sāṅkhya philosophy : ददृशुः कपिलं तत्र वासुदेवं सनातनम्.

We have not been able to ascertain which Purāṇa represents Kapila as an incarnation but the foregoing arguments will, we believe, stand the test of such an enquiry.

If the representation of Kapila, founder of the Sāṅkhya philosophy, as an incarnation of Viṣṇu makes the Bhāgavata later than Śaṅkara, its general acceptance of the Advaita philosophy of Śaṅkara and its freedom from any touch of the Dvaita philosophy of Madhva and even of the modified Advaita philosophy of Rāmānuja make it probable that the Bhāgavata preceded in time, both Rāmānuja and Madhva. It would be a very difficult task to ascertain exactly how far the Vedānta of the Bhāgavata partakes of the Advaita of Śaṅkara or of the Dvaita of Madhva or the modified Advaita of Rāmānuja, and one must have studied carefully the philosophical works of Madhva, Rāmānuja and Śaṅkara to be able to make such a comparison. But on a general survey of the Bhāgavata one cannot doubt that the Vaiṣṇavism of the Bhāgavata is neither influenced by, nor akin to, the Vaiṣṇavism of Madhva. Nor is there any open or covert opposition to the worship of Śiva in the Bhāgavata ; there is in fact no sectarian animosity therein towards Śiva worship. We may, therefore, be tolerably certain that the Bhāgavata precedes Madhva unquestionably and Rāmānuja probably and hence may properly be placed in the 10th century A.D.

Lastly we shall try to see how far the historical and geographical statements in the Bhāgavata support the date proposed above. In Skandha 12 we have a chapter on the 'future' kings of Bhāratavarṣa ; and here we have a detailed mention of the Yavana kings of Kilalilā with the total number 106 of the years of their rule. This certainly makes the Bhāgavata later in date than these kings.

We have shown at length in our *History of Mediæval Hindu India*, vol. I, that these kings ruled in Āndhra in the 8th and 9th centuries A.D., and hence this reference in the Bhāgavata makes it later than these centuries.

Before we comment further on this reference we must refer to the opinion of some Indian scholars (who consider the Bhāgavata to be very old) that this chapter relating to 'future' kings is an interpolation. It no doubt looks like an interpolation, as it is disconnected with what precedes and follows it. Strangely enough the chapter is introduced with a request made by Parīkṣit: "Please tell me what kingly family came after Śrīkṛṣṇa left this earth." The word is अभवत् in the past tense: कस्य वंशोऽभवत् पृथ्व्याम्. And the reply is, such and such kings *will* rule hereafter. Purañjaya the last of the Bārhadratha of Magadha (who again is a 'future' ruler) is already described. This introductory question, we think, may be treated as an interpolation and not the whole chapter. For to give a list of 'future' kings had become traditional with Purāṇas; and the author of the Bhāgavata, whose acquaintance with other Purāṇas as well as with Vedic literature cannot be doubted, could not have been satisfied without a chapter on 'future' kings. It is, therefore, very probable that this chapter is not an interpolation and we proceed to draw the natural inferences from it.

It may be stated that the chapter on 'future' kings in the Vāyu seems to be the oldest one of its kind; the Viṣṇu Purāṇa follows it and the Bhāgavata follows the Viṣṇu. Now the Vāyu merely mentions Vindhyaśakti of the Kailikilas and not his successors nor the total length of the reign of this line (Chap. 99, v. 370). The Viṣṇu Purāṇa however gives full information about this line as follows (Aṁśa 4, Chap. 24):

तेषूत्सन्नेषु कैंकिला यवना भूपतयो भविष्यन्त्यमूर्द्धाभिषिक्ता: । तेषामपत्यं विन्ध्यशक्तिस्तत: पुरञ्जयस्तस्माद्रामचन्द्रस्तस्माद्धर्मवर्मा ततो वङ्गस्ततो भूनन्दनस्तत: सुनन्दी तद्भ्राता नन्दियशा: शुक: प्रवीर: । एते वर्षशतं षड्वर्षाणि भूपतयो भविष्यन्ति ॥

This shows that the writer of the Viṣṇu knew these kings intimately. While for kings before these it has given family names

without individual names such as:

सप्ताभीराः दश गर्दभिनः। अष्टौ यवनाश्चतुर्दश तुरुष्कारा मुण्डाश्च त्रयोदश एकादश मौनाः।

and the total number of years for all these, viz. 1090 years; for this Kaiṁkila Yavana line it has given names of individual kings and their reign as 106 years. The Yavana kings are referred to in the Bhāgalpore inscription of Dharmapāla of Bengal (800-825 A.D.) and it is very probable that this line of Kaiṁkila Yavanas ruled in Āndhra from about 750 to 860 A.D. These are only probable dates and we may say that the Vāyu Purāṇa (which mentions Vindhyaśakti only and not the other kings) belongs to the 8th century A.D. and the Viṣṇu to the 9th. The Bhāgavata follows Viṣṇu and has given this line in a mutilated form. It first makes Kilakilā a town, secondly it omits the first Vindhyaśakti and gives only five successors' names, the total number of years being however the same 106:

किलकिलायां नृपतयो भूतनन्दोऽथ वङ्गिरिः।
शिशुनन्दिश्च तद्भ्राता यशोनन्दिः प्रवीरकः॥
इत्येते वै वर्षशतं भविष्यन्त्यधिकानि षट्॥

—Bhāgav., Skandha 12, Chap. 1.

This shows that the author knows very little about this line and makes a copy, perhaps purposely mutilated, from the Viṣṇu Purāṇa. It may therefore be properly placed in the 10th century A.D.

This conclusion is further supported by two other considerations appearing on a comparison of these lists of future kings in Vāyu, Viṣṇu and Bhāgavata. These lists always give detailed information about the Bārhadratha, the Maurya, the Śaiśunāga, the Kāṇva and the Āndhrabhṛtya lines of emperors of Magadha and bring their detailed history down to about 200 A.D. This information is probably derived from Buddhist sources as shown by European scholars. Then the lists make general mention of Gardhabhilas, Śakas, Yavanas, Muṇḍas, Maunaś, etc., and assign to all of them a total of about 1000 years. Thus the Vāyu gives 10 Ābhīras, 7 Gardhabis, 10 Śakas, 8 Yavanas, 14 Tuṣāras, 13 Muṇḍas and 18 Maunas. Comparing this with the Viṣṇu Purāṇa list we have first instead of Tuṣāras, Turuṣkas. (Instead of यवनाष्टौ भविष्यन्ति तुषाराश्च चतुर्दश

of the Vāyu we have in the Viṣṇu ततश्चाष्टौ यवनाश्चतुर्दश तुरुष्काः). This change from Tuṣāra to Turuṣka is historically important. Tuṣāras are different from Turuṣkas (or Turks), who only came to India about the 9th century A.D. We may hence take the Vāyu to precede the 9th century and the Viṣṇu to belong to the 9th century. The Bhāgavata follows Viṣṇu in this and has Turuṣkas instead of Tuṣāras and comes later with a further change:

ततोऽष्टौ यवना भाव्याश्चतुर्दश तुरुष्ककाः ।
भूयो दश गुरुण्डाश्च मौना एकादशैव तु ॥
—Bhāgav. 12. 1. 30.

The second change to be noted is about the Guptas. The Vāyu has the lines:

अनुगंगं प्रयागं च साकेतं मगधांस्तथा ।
एताञ्जनपदान्सर्वान् भोक्ष्यन्ते गुप्तवंशजाः ॥

This shows that the Vāyu must have followed the Guptas whose power came to end about 500 A.D. and hence may properly be placed in the 8th century since it shows a vague recollection of the Guptas. The author of the Bhāgavata seems to have forgotten all about the Guptas, properly speaking has no knowledge of them at all and changing this śloka applies it to the fictitious king of Magadha named Viśvasphūrji[5] as follows :

अनुगङ्गमाप्रयागं गुप्तां भोक्ष्यति मेदिनीम् ।

Clearly the Bhāgavata must have been written long after the Guptas had passed away; for in their time they were known even in the South and in the Draviḍa country (to which the author probably belonged as we presently will show) and hence the Bhāgavata may be placed in the 10th century A.D.

The geographical references in the Bhāgavata are not many; but the most important of these is in the description of the tīrthayātrā of Balarāma. There is no enumeration of the countries or peoples of India, as in the Mahābhārata and the Skandha

[5] He is Visphūrjani in the Vāyu and plainly fictitious. In the account of 'future' kings fact and fiction may plainly be jumbled together.

and other Purāṇas. But this description of holy places (Chap. 79, 10) is interesting when compared with similar chapters of the Vanaparva (Mahābhārata). The noticeable difference is that the sacred places in South India are more detailed here than in the Mahābhārata or even in the Skandha Purāṇa. These Tīrthas are Śrī-Śaila the abode of Śaṅkara and the temple of Veṅkaṭa in Draviḍa, Kāmakoṣṇi and Kāñcī ; Śrīraṅgamahākṣetra where Hari is always present ; Ṛṣabhādri, the kṣetra of Hari and the Mathurā of the South (viz. Madhurā), Samudrasetu, Malaya wherein resides Agastya, the Kanyā Durgā Devī, the five ponds of Arjuna ; Kerala Tīrtha, Gokarṇa the kṣetra of Śiva where he is always present ; Āryā Dvaipāyanī and Śūrpāraka. The Mahābhārata mentions only the last and the five ponds of Arjuna. The mention of Veṅkaṭa, Śrīraṅga and southern Mathurā especially point to modern times and the detailed mention of these modern Vaiṣṇava sacred places makes it probable that the Bhāgavata Purāṇa arose in the Draviḍa country. Āryā Dvaipāyanī is also very interesting though it is not clearly identifiable. It refers probably to a goddess in an island and as it stands in the list between Gokarṇa and Śūrpāraka, it probably means a Devī temple in the island of Uraṇ near Bombay ; Bombay in the 10th century had no existence as a town but this island of Uraṇ was once the capital of a Konkan kingdom and the huge elephants carved in rock which existed so late as the days of the Portuguese have given the name of Elephanta to the island, the caves in which are still worth a visit. This town probably contained a noted Devī shrine in the days of the Śilāhāra kingdom of North Konkan. And this reference, if it is clearly identified, makes the Bhāgavata belong to about the 10th century A.D. The references to noted Vaiṣṇava holy places in the Draviḍa country lead to the same inference most strongly.

The probability that the writer of the Bhāgavata Purāṇa belonged to the Draviḍa country is strengthened by another reference to that country which is worth noticing. The Bhāgavata states that in the Kaliyuga the devotees of Viṣṇu will be rare ; but they will be found in great number in the Draviḍa country where the rivers Tāmraparṇī, Kṛtamālā, Payasvinī, Kāverī, and Pratīcī

flow. Those who drink the water of these rivers become purified in heart and will be devoted to Vāsudeva:

ये· पिबन्ति जलं तासां मनुजा मनुजेश्वर ।
प्रायो भक्ता भविष्यन्ति वासुदेवेऽमलाशया: ॥

Bhāgav. 10. 5. 40.

This is indeed true and the cult of Vāsudeva worship no doubt still flourishes in the Draviḍa country. But had the writer of the Bhāgavata not belonged to Draviḍa he would not have praised it so strongly, ignoring his own country; for Vāsudeva worship is tolerably prevalent in other places also. Another reference to the Draviḍa country similarly shows the partiality of the author to it. In Skandha 4 we have the story that a daughter of Rājasiṁha of Vidarbha was married to Malayadhvaja, king of the Paṇḍyas, and from them were born "seven sons who became founders of the seven Dravidian kingly lines." This story with the mention of seven Dravidian royal families is to be found probably in the Bhāgavata only and further shows the intimate acquaintance of the author with Draviḍa. Hence it seems very likely that the author of the Bhāgavata lived in the Draviḍa country. But whether this is so or not the facts and considerations set forth in this paper do not leave much doubt about its being a work of the tenth century.

BRIEF NOTES

The Ancient Indian Symbol for the Foreign Sound Z

[A Supplementary Note]

In my article entitled " The Ancient Indian Symbol for the foreign sound Z" (above, vol. 26, pp. 159 ff.) I have stated at one place (p. 160) as follows:

" I may note here that eighteen years earlier (J.R.A.S., 1881 A.D., pp. 526—527, "*The Epoch of the Guptas*") Dr. Thomas favoured Burgess' reading *Syamotika*."

And having quoted fully a passage from that article, I have criticized the views of the writer at some length.

I hasten now to correct one statement in it which relates to the authorship of the article; for I find that the writer of that article of 1881 was Mr. Edward Thomas and not Dr. F.W. Thomas. While offering my sincere apology to Dr. Thomas for this unpardonable error on my part, I may be permitted to state how the error originated. I do not wish to excuse myself; my only object is to account for the aberration. It was thus: Rapson, to whose paper in *JRAS.* 1899 I have made a reference in my article, says at p. 370:

" In Thomas's article on the " Epoch of the Guptas," in the Journal for 1881, p. 524," etc.

This led me to assume that Dr. F. W. Thomas was meant. I failed to look—as I should have looked—at the name of Edward Thomas at the beginning of the article. Hence my blunder, which I regret now most sincerely.

N. B. DIVATIA.

---

[1] **A consequential correction should be made at p. 165 of my article in reference: in line 10 from the bottom of the page for " Dr. Thomas " read " Edward Thomas."—Also page 160, line 12, for " 1890 A.D." read " 1899 A.D."**

The Sātavāhanas

I am bound to form and express an opinion on the issues raised in the article "The Home of the Śātavāhanas" published in a recent number of the *Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society (Bangalore)*, vol. 13, pp. 591 ff., in which the author, Mr. T. N. Subramaniam of Kumbakonam, cites and criticizes a certain theory regarding the home of the so-called Āndhra kings which, I believe, I was the first to formulate. In 1919 I published a short article in the first issue (pp. 21-42) of the *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute*, drawing attention to certain prevailing misconceptions about the Sātavāhanas. This article is the subject of Mr. Subramaniam's criticism. While admitting the validity of my main contention that the Sātavāhanas are *not* Āndhras and that their original home was *not* Āndhradeśa, he takes exception to certain statements in the body of the article which, according to him, *contradict* the main thesis. It is not my intention to go into details and to take up space which can probably be ill spared. I shall content myself with correcting the erroneous impression created by Mr. Subramaniam's note, which in part misquotes my words and misrepresents my views.

I have nowhere asserted that "the Sātavāhanas *have* to be looked upon as belonging to the tribe of the Āndhras," as Mr. Subramaniam appears to think (op. cit. p. 592). That is only one of the alternatives considered and *rejected* by me. Assuming *for the sake of argument* that the Purāṇic view is correct, I wrote: "*If*" (in order to reconcile the Purāṇic statement with our conclusion)—"If... the Sātavāhanas have to be looked upon as belonging to the tribe of the Āndhras, then" certain consequences will follow (*ABI*. 1, 41). Further on in the course of the same paragraph I reject the alternative proposed as untenable, concluding the paragraph with the words: "There is nothing improbable in the assumption that the founders of the Sātavāhana dynasty were originally the vassals of the Āndhra sovereigns, of whom it may, with assurance, be affirmed that at or about the time of the rise of the Sātavāhanas they were the most powerful potentates in the Deccan."

I must frankly admit, however, that the wording of the last paragraph of my article in question is rather abstruse and apt to confuse and mislead a casual reader. I welcome therefore this opportunity to restate my old views more lucidly as follows. I hold : (1) that no cogent reason having been shown for connecting the *early* Sātavāhana kings with the Āndhradeśa, their activity should be regarded as restricted to the western and south-western portion of the Deccan plateau ; only *later* kings of this dynasty extended their sway eastwards, so that subsequently even the Āndhradeśa was included in the Sātavāhana dominions; the Sātavāhana migration was *from the west to the east* ; (2) that the Sātavāhanas are different from, and should not be confused with, the Āndhras mentioned in Greek and Chinese chronicles ; (3) that the home (or the early habitat) of the Sātavāhanas is to be looked for on the western side of the peninsula and is *perhaps* to be located in the province then known as Sātavahani-hāra—a province of which the situation is unknown or uncertain.

I see at present no reason to alter my views regarding the date of the Myākadoni inscription, and I am not prepared to accept the date proposed for it by Mr. Subramaniam. I will admit, however, that Mr. Subramaniam has offered a very happy explanation of the Purāṇic anomaly. He points out that even the oldest Purāṇas are not older than the third century A.D. Thus at the period when the earliest Purāṇas were compiled, the Sātavāhanas had been established firmly, for over a century, as a paramount power in the Āndhradeśa. Moreover it is highly probable that about that period they had been relieved of their possessions in the west. The Purāṇic chroniclers thus knew the Sātavāhanas only as rulers of the Āndhradeśa, and probably *mistook* them for Āndhras. This explanation is much simpler and more satisfactory, on the whole, than those I have offered in my article.

V. S. SUKTHANKAR.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

THE RELIGION OF THE ṚIGVEDA. By H. D. GRISWOLD, PH. D., D.D. Oxford University Press, 1923. [The Religious Quest of India Series.]

This is a useful and interesting book for the general reader, but at the same time is not without attraction for the Vedic student and scholar. The publication can claim the right to existence—among similar attempts at the same subject—on account of its method, of the matter, and the purpose.

To take the purpose first, Griswold tries to show that the religion of the Veda was a kind of Proto-Evangelium which by some tragedy, as unexpected and unique as inexplicable, was broken off to find its natural and even necessary fulfilment in the Christian religion. There can indeed be little doubt that the Ṛgvedic religion contains elements which look like a promise of a full completion somewhere else and at another time, but it cannot be denied either that in Vedic times there were tendencies as well as deficiencies in the theological and religious views which forbid us to consider the Christian doctrine as something like the lineal descendant and logical fulfilment of the Aryan religion expressed in the Vedas. As far as the view is correct it seems to hold good of other religious systems to the same, if not a greater, degree of truth. It might at times require less acrobatic talents to cross the Cinvat Bridge of the Avesta than to follow the viaduct which the author builds between the Ṛgvedic religion and the Christian creed. Cautiously he remarks himself (on p. 360) that "the points of contact [between the two religions] must not be over-emphasized". In any case the statement of the view is gratefully to be acknowledged, and the frankness and courage with which the author's standpoint is expressed deserves praise.

Dr. Griswold's view on the relation between the Ṛgvedic religion and Christian doctrine may hang together with his method, though it need not be a logical consequence of it. That method is

indicated in the Editorial Preface, where the Joint Editors of the Series, of whom the writer is one, state in almost so many words that they will look at the problems they discuss with Christian eyes. Or, to put it more technically, they will take a comparative attitude in inquiring into the facts and weighing their value. Nothing could be more reasonable than that. For " no man approaches the study of a religion without religious convictions, either positive or negative" (p. IV). If ever an unscientific principle was made the supposition of scientific search, study and conclusion, it is Voraussetzungslosigkeit. For there is no such thing as Voraussetzungslosigkeit, not so very rarely a mere misnomer for dogmatism of a vicious type, and this chimera of a rationalistic imagination should now definitely belong to the past. On the other hand, a comparative attitude, controlled by logical and critical principles, will prove a helpful guide in detecting points of interest and importance that otherwise might easily escape the eye. *Vae soli!* An instance in point is the writer's query (on p. 62) :— ". . . may not many of the phenomena of repetition in the Ṛ(ig)-v(eda), even as in the O(ld) T(estament) Psalms and in the Qurān, be due to a stereotyped religious vocabulary, in which the same phrases would naturally tend to recur ?" The writer's comparative viewpoint is seen too in the imposing bibliography and the running footnotes. The former conscientiously registers the classics on each subject as well as the latest publications of note. The abbreviations are not so comfortable as short.

In the Foreword the author modestly remarks that he " can claim only a moderate acquaintance with the text of the *Rigveda*, in this respect falling short of the linguistic equipment possessed by the great Vedic scholars of the world". This shortcoming has not done so much harm to the book, as " the fact of residence in the Punjab for nearly thirty years " has done it good. It is perhaps a little too much to call the Punjab " the fifth Veda", but an intimate acquaintance with the country and its features, the atmospheric conditions, the data of flora, fauna and ethnography, as well as of the linguistic facts of to-day, is the next best thing to replace the encyclopedia which was never written by the Vedic ṛṣis and ancient interpreters. This, needless to say, is true if the

bulk of the Ṛgvedic hymns has been composed in the Punjab. Happily those are few who think that the Aryans, migrating from their old homes and breaking through the Khyber Pass (and Citral and Gilgit ?) into India, carried the Vedic hymns in their knapsacks as *spolia Aegyptiorum*. But many a thing that has been said or suggested anent the Ṛgveda looks very much less likely on the spot where the hymns probably were composed than it may do on the bank of the Thames, the Seine or the Spree. And if the writer feels a little diffident because of the lack of linguistic equipment, he enjoys the advantage of writing on a subject on which he can bring to bear the general professional knowledge of a theologian. This is an asset which is not to be undervalued, considering the confidence with which mere philologists write on the theology and the religion of the Veda and the frequent consequences of their courage.

As for the matter of the book the reviewer has to remember that Dr. Griswold is mainly relating the results arrived at by "the great Vedic scholars of the world", and giving their hypotheses. It would then be unfair to take him to task for what they have said, except in cases where he sides with one or the other of the usually warring parties. The following casual remarks have been suggested by the perusal of the book. The author says (Foreword, p. IX): "If it is impossible to understand present-day Hinduism without a knowledge of the *Rigveda*, the reverse is also true that it is impossible to understand the *Rigveda* without a knowledge of modern Hinduism." The reverse may be true to a certain, but hardly to the same, extent. "The original home of the I(ndo)-E(uropean) peoples is unknown" (p. 16), the writer has to confess. Such is the result of upwards of a century's guesses, hypotheses and polemics on the question of the first habitat of the ancient Indians and the other members of the whole ethnographical family. Such an upshot of honest endeavours may indeed be a consolation for Dr. Faust, but it is not very encouraging in our short-lived time to find oneself after a hundred years' labour back at the starting point. For completeness' sake the writer might have adduced L. v. Schroeder, who in *Arische Religion*, vol. I, pp. 214-29, with his usual erudition and eloquence proposes a view

that in itself essentially coincides with Meyer's, but is supported by reasons of his own. Whether with such a past and prospect the question of the original home of the Indo-European peoples may be called a "stimulating problem" (p. 16), must remain a matter of taste. Dr. Griswold however is sure of the approval of all who know the country and its culture sufficiently well, when he says that "India is a land of archaic survivals" and, one may add, of torsos. If on p. 34 the author puts down 1500 B.C. as the date for the entrance of the Āryas into the Punjab, he naturally must be prepared to modify his statement in keeping with the age of the Veda. His interpretation of "brāhmaṇa" as "son of a brahman," and his conclusion from it to the hereditary character of the priesthood should be punctuated by a mark of interrogation rather than by a full stop. The importance of the term "śiśnadeva" for the origin or preservation of phallus worship in India might be brought into clearer relief. The remark (p. 60) that it is easier to read metrically from the pada than the saṁhitā text probably will find scanty support both from the Indian Vedins and the Western scholars who have made a serious study of the text. On p. 64 the writer supposes--if we do not misread him—"the literary form of a living vernacular" to be identical with "a more archaic dialect than was commonly spoken", a statement which may not find favour with the grammarian and linguist.

The thorny question of Vedic chronology is treated of on pp. 67ff. At the end of the paragraph Whitney's ninepins of Vedic age dates are once more set up. *Difficile est satiram non scribere* when we find them in almost the same places in which M. Müller "in his brilliant pioneer volume, *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature,* published in 1859," had put them. Even the formidable array of mighty names behind the *Cambridge History of India*, published in 1922, is perhaps not enough to convert every unbelieving Thomas to Max Müller's suggestion, which too often has been raised to the rank of a theory. In the chapter on The Interpretation of the Ṛigveda (pp. 75ff.), Pischel and Geldner's share of positive contribution has been undervalued rather than overstated. Rightly has the author on pp. 108-10 with A. A. Macdonell (*Ved. Mythology*, p. 16f.) and others declined Max

Müller's theory of Henotheism or Kathenotheism ; of Swāmī Dayānand Saraswatī's Monotheism in the Ṛgveda an unbiassed, critical reading of the text is sufficient refutation. That a Semitic influence may possibly be recognized in the number of the Ādityas and Amesha Spentas may with Dr. Griswold be granted, but the Semitic origin of Varuṇa and the other sons of Aditi is justly denied. The reviewer has said in another place (*A Second Selection of Hymns from the Rgveda,* 2nd ed., B. S. P. S. LVIII, Appendix IV, p. LXXXIII) that the Indian Āryas were surely not so god-forsaken as to have to borrow from a Semitic people practically the only moral deity they possess in their mythology. The author finds Hillebrandt's view on the mythological essence of Indra " brilliantly stated, but in its totality . . . not convincing". Nor is the theory that " Indra must be regarded throughout as the wielder of lightning " of such overwhelming certainty as to force assent (cp. *Second Selection,* App. IV, pp. CIV ff.) On p. 218 the writer gives up in despair the identification of the plant from which Soma in India was got, another " stimulating problem". Dr. Griswold, observing (p. 252) that " the immortality of Uṣas is made up of the twin processes of dying [implied] and of being born again at dawn," suggests that " this is a most potent and pregnant analogy, [which is] sure to have had its effect in furthering the later doctrine of rebirth". But why not let the reflecting mind of ancient India take the clue to the theory of rebirth and transmigration of the soul from the general fact of death and renaissance in the kingdoms of animals and plants ? The bījāṅkuranyāya, so familiar to the classical Vedānta, would seem to point that way. It might be interesting to know how many Vedic scholars besides Brunnhofer (and possibly Kaegi) are prepared to agree with Dr. Griswold's statement that " the whole Ṛgvedic collection is lyric " (p. 333).

That " magic is present to-day in every religion " is so general a thesis that it is much easier to propound than to prove it. The meaning and history of " brahman " is probably not quite so simple as the writer—a little categorically—would have it when he says : " It was the inherent potency of the sacred formula, due to a magical conception thereof, which led finally to the sup-

reme conception of *brahman* as identical with *ātman*, the 'soul' of the universe." In the very original chapter XIII, The Fulfilment of the Religion of the Veda, the author avers : —" Nominal monotheism has not infrequently been made really polytheistic, for example in Zoroastrianism through the counter-reformation of the younger Avesta which restored so many of the old daevas and in Roman Christianity as well as in Islām through the adoration of saints." The reviewer leaves this view to its fate as far as it touches on Zoroastrianism and Islām ; he is concerned as far as " Roman Christianity " is in question. The context leaves no doubt that the learned author when he wrote the above had not the ignorant, uneducated " Roman Christian " in his mind, whose practice of religion may be contaminated either by rationalism or superstition of the surroundings, but the official creed and the scientific exposition of " Roman Christianity". The reviewer challenges the learned Doctor of Divinity to produce any authoritative pronouncement or scientific proposition, explanation or defence of polytheism through the adoration of saints. Till that is forthcoming this statement by the author is to be considered as but a slip, which to the advantage of the whole book can easily be dropped in the second edition that *The Religion of the Rigveda* otherwise so well deserves.

R. ZIMMERMANN.

THE JOURNAL OF THE UNITED PROVINCES HISTORICAL SOCIETY, December 1923. Vol. III, Part 1. Longmans, Green & Co.

The *Journal* is edited by the learned Professor of Modern Indian History at the University of Allahabad, Dr. Shafaat Ahmad Khan, Litt. D., M.L.C., who is also the Honorary Secretary of the United Provinces Historical Society. In the fascicule before us, Dr. Khan's paper entitled " Documents on Seventeenth-Century British India, in the Public Record Office, Chancery Lane," a scholarly survey of a part of the documentary material available for the study of an interesting chapter in Modern Indian History,

is followed by the second instalment of an article dealing with "Place-names in the United Provinces of Agra and Oudh" by Paul Whalley, Bengal Civil Service (retired), which is a study of place-names in those provinces from the linguistic and historical stand-point. The author begins his study by dividing place-names broadly into compounds and derivatives. The compounds are then sub-divided into three groups, municipal, rural and religious. Then the closely allied category of double names is considered, the analysis ending with an enumeration of the principal prefixes i.e. elements which can be prefixed to the descriptive portion of names, mostly giving them the appearance of double names. The names considered by Mr. Whalley belong, with insignificant exceptions, to the period posterior to the Muhammadan influx. "The history of a people," says Mr. Whalley, "impresses itself upon its onomatology, and it would be an interesting task to illustrate this by following place-names down the path of history." The author therefore explains that "if we reverse the process, taking the modern names first, it is because the nature of the material at our disposal compels us to do so. We must mount up from the present to the past, because otherwise the past would be unintelligible." This is undoubtedly true. The object of the inquiry is ethnological and historical, though the point of view adopted by the author in the present investigation is grammatical. The author frankly admits his inability to do full justice to the question, since its grammatical aspect needs to be dealt with by one who has undergone a rigid philological training. Some of the derivations and explanations proposed by Mr. Whalley are not wholly satisfactory. We cannot endorse, for instance, the derivation of *kubja* (in the place-name Kānya-kubja) from *kūpa* 'well'; it is equally difficult to follow the author in assigning the meaning 'new' to *kānya* or *kanya*, which, according to him, is the hypothetical positive corresponding to the defective comparative Skt. *kanīyas*: Gr. *kainos* (for **kainyos*). Whatever its explanation, we think that the name is a compound of two elements meaning 'maiden' and 'humpbacked'; compare the analogous formation Kanyākumārī, which evidently means 'virgin damsel.' It seems equally inadmissible to trace Auñccha to Skt. *varṣa* 'a division of the world.' Notwithstanding a few

such shortcomings, the paper is full of wise observations and interesting derivations. We hope that this very suggestive essay of Mr. Whalley will inspire Sanskritists to turn their attention to this sadly neglected field of study.—The extract from a letter from Mr. H. Beveridge to the Editor, which follows, fails to throw any light on the mystery of the stone elephant at Ajmere.—The next article, "Indian Education in the Seventh Century A.D." by Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji, M.A., Ph. D., Professor of Indian History, University of Lucknow, is an able and useful summary of information, gleaned from the itinerary of I-tsing (672-88 A.D.), regarding the condition of elementary and higher education as well as rules governing the education and organization of the monasteries, as given by the pilgrim. The adequacy of dealing these questions together is explained by Dr. Mookerji on the ground that "the entire system of Indian education, whether Brahmanical or Buddhist, was based upon the principle of a personal touch or relationship between the teacher and the taught, whether the sphere of its working lay in the individual household of the teacher or in the collective establishment of the monastery." —In a remarkably well-written article, Mr. S. Iftikhar Husain Saheb unfolds the life of "A Nineteenth Century Saint," Haji Sayyad Shah Waris Ali Saheb of Dewa, a very famous Sufi (born *ca.* 1235 A.H.). In dealing with the creed of Haji Saheb, the author has a few words to say on the cardinal principles of Sufism, its origin, elevation and degeneration.—The last paper in this issue, which is by Mr. W. H. Moreland, seeks to throw "Some Side-lights on Life in Agra, 1637-39." The author has utilized for this purpose the original documents containing the expenditure accounts of the Agra factory for the years 1637-9, which now form Nos. 120 and 123 of the W. Geleynssen de Jongh Collection in the Public Record Office at the Hague. The documents at the disposal of Mr. Moreland do not show the commercial transactions of the Dutch factory in Agra, but detail what may be called the 'overhead' charges. They give month by month the expenditure on diet of factors, stable, servants' wages, messengers, etc. A patient and systematic study of the short entries in accounts and commercial documents, and a few continuous narratives, enables the author to gather valuable information bearing on the life of the Dutch factors,

the economic life and monthly prices in Agra, the means of communication, and the building costs of that period, and thus to give us a glimpse of the life and activities of the Dutch factors and their contemporaries in Agra of the second quarter of the seventēenth century.—The issue before us contains much good material and the *Journal* is full of promise. We compliment the learned Editor on this fine achievement, which challenges comparison with the best conducted Journals of its kind.

V. S. S.

A Practical Sanskrit Dictionary with Transliteration, Accentuation, and Etymological Analysis. By Arthur Anthony Macdonell, M.A., Ph. D., Hon. LL.D., Boden Professor of Sanskrit, Fellow of Balliol College, Fellow of the British Academy. Oxford University Press, 1924. Pp. xii+382. (Price 30 shillings.)

The Oxford University Press has brought out a "reissue, corrected," of Professor Macdonell's well-known Sanskrit-English Dictionary, which has been out of print for some time. The aim of the dictionary, we are told, in the Preface, is "to satisfy, within the compass of a comparatively handy volume, all the practical wants not only of learners of Sanskrit, but also of scholars for purposes of ordinary reading." The work probably does satisfy the modest wants of the learners of Sanskrit at the British Universities, but it is doubtful to us whether it meets the requirements of scholars, even for purposes of ordinary reading.

Two radical defects that should have been removed in a reissue of the work are these: (1) the obsolete, unsightly and irritating system of transliteration which yields in the roman script such equivalents as *KHRI*D of Sanskrit छृद् and *ghana-ghan*â-ya of Sanskrit झणझणाय; and (2) the inadequacy of the publication to serve as a complete and satisfactory glossary even to the 120 Vedic hymns, 1 Brāhmaṇa, 3 Sūtra texts and about 40 post-Vedic works, for which, professedly, the dictionary is meant to supply a vocabulary.

The recourse to an anastatic reprint of Professor Macdonell's dictionary appears at first sight to disparage the learned activities of the past generation of oriental scholars, because it seems to imply that during the last thirty years no significant additions have been made to Sanskrit lexicography, which is unquestionably a progressive science and in which some progress has undoubtedly been made since the appearance of the first edition of the dictionary in 1892. But evidently no such disparagement is intended by the learned Professor or the enterprizing Publisher. There is every indication that the work is designed principally to meet the practical requirements of junior college students in England, and to them the advance made in the science of Sanskrit lexicography during the last three decades is, we suppose, a matter of little or no consequence.

Many words and meanings appear in this dictionary with an asterisk (*) against them, precisely as in the original edition. This asterisk was affixed to them by the painstaking author for the purpose of drawing the attention of the reader to the important fact that the respective words and meanings are "quotable only from native grammarians and lexicographers." Users of the dictionary are therefore advised to refer, in all important cases, to the new revised edition of the St. Petersburg Lexicon, now being published in Germany, where they may find quite good attestations for many of the words and meanings condemned, some thirty years ago, by the erudite Boden Professor.

Even though the work may have been reprinted mainly to satisfy the practical needs of junior students of Sanskrit at British Universities, the learned doyen of Oriental studies at Oxford and the accredited publisher to the University would—we cannot refrain from remarking—have done greater service to the cause of Sanskrit learning by placing at the disposal even of these students a work from which the defects referred to above had been eradicated than by prolonging, by means of photographic reproduction, the life of an antiquated publication.

V. S. S.

RELIGIOUS LIFE IN ANCIENT EGYPT. By SIR FLINDERS PETRIE, F.R.S., F.B.A. Constable, London, 1924. Pp. x+221.

This is an excellent little book—a companion volume to that on the *Social Life in Ancient Egypt*—to place in the hands of those who wish to learn something about the ancient Egyptian religion as part of the daily life and in its social connections. "The more primitive and popular beliefs," we are told, in the Preface, "are placed together, as representing those earlier stages which must be grasped before we can understand the growth of the system of later times." Our knowledge of the origins of the Egyptian religion and institutions has been greatly extended by the new material of the early ages which has been found in recent work. The aim of the present volume is to link the information gleaned from the new discoveries with the historical records already known.

In successive chapters the author deals with the following aspects of the Egyptian religion: the gods and their temples, the priesthood and its teaching, the faith in the gods, the future life, the burial and the tomb, and finally the folk beliefs; and he gives us a vivid and accurate insight into the religious activities of Ancient Egyptians. There is a charming coloured frontispiece reproducing a scene from a tomb of the XIXth dynasty (*ca.* 1500 B.C.) in which the Tree-goddess is shown as appearing in the branches of a sycomore tree and holding a tray of cakes and fruits and a vase of drink which she pours out to the lady before her, who is accompanied by a seated official, "the keeper of the garden and lake of the palace of Rameses II in the temple of Amen."

In connection with the question of the dissemination of Indian ideas and beliefs, we may here draw attention to the view of Sir Flinders Petrie that the "mystic frame of mind [of the Egyptian] was largely influenced by Indian thought during the Persian dynasties." "The doctrine of rebirth," he adds, "favoured by throwing all the bodily senses into abeyance, and brought to pass by driving out the twelve inner torments by their antitheses, is evidently due to Indian influence."

The gifted author of the little volume noticed here has been credited with possessing "the art of taking a mass of detail and

evolving from it a scheme at once so simple and so convincing that the reader is surprised that it was never thought of before." One has only to glance over the contents to realize the truth of this remark.

V. S. S.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

Royal Asiatic Society

Annual Report for 1923

In April of the past year our Society lost, in the person of Sir Narayan Chandavarkar, a figure who for years has been most closely associated with its progress and fortunes. He had been a member since 1889, Vice-President and President successively for over 20 years, and gave ungrudgingly of his time, influence and scholarship to the administration and advance of the Society.

At its June Meeting the Managing Committee resolved to ask the Hon. Sir Justice LALLUBHAI A. SHAH to accept the Presidentship, and the Society has had the good fortune of his guidance since July.

In October the Society received the distinguished Oriental Scholar, Professor Dr. M. WINTERNITZ of Prague University and, after a pleasant opportunity of personal conversation with him, heard a stimulating discourse on the subject he had made specially his own: "Mahābhārata Criticism."

In February of the year under review one of our most distinguished members Rao Bahadur P. B. JOSHI received from the hands of His Excellency Sir George Lloyd a special Campbell Memorial Medal in recognition of the great services to scholarship that he rendered in assisting the late Sir James Campbell in the publication of the Bombay Gazetteer.

The Society's plans for the encouragement of Oriental research are advancing in two directions, namely, that the design of its Silver Medal to be awarded biennially for valuable research carried out in the previous two years is being prepared, and also the first list of persons worthy—for scholarship or for other assistance to the Society's aims—to be elected Fellows, is under consideration.

For the protection of its large and valuable collection of Manuscripts a form of Indemnity Bond to cover possible losses by loan has been decided on. The Manuscript Catalogue, so long needed, is complete and about to be printed.

Last year's report emphasized the pressing need of a revision of the form of publication of our Journal, and it is a pleasure to announce that the Journal Sub-Committee has ready a complete scheme for the furture editorship and conduct of its organ that should bring it into line with the leading Oriental publications.

Along with the Manuscripts, our valuable books—many of them of the greatest importance as sources, and quite unreplaceable—have been a cause of anxiety. To meet the case of these, solid and ample accommodation has been made in the gallery of the office room, where such works will be under constant supervision and reasonably safe from molestation.

Some three years ago, it was resolved, in consequence of loss of space, to transfer the Society's Collections in Archæology, Geology and Numismatics as permanent loans to the Prince of Wales Museum. The first named collection is already arranged and in exhibition; the Geological collection, which is believed to represent Bombay and Salsette completely and is therefore unique, has been in a pitifully decayed condition notwithstanding heroic attempts at care and classification in the '50's and '60's of last century, and is now awaiting final treatment at the hands of Principal Blatter of St. Xavier's College before exhibition. The numismatic collection should be classified and ready for transference in a few months.

Two other tasks, nearer to the interests of the majority of members, still await completion. The first, a card catalogue of the library according to the Dewey System is begun and will be made available as sections are completed. The second—the Revision of the Society's rules, urged by many members in view of changed conditions and the formal unsatisfactoriness of the existing list—is begun and will be one of the principal tasks of the coming year.

One great labour that has demanded attention we can at least claim as completed. This is a Provident Fund Scheme for the Society's employées. The original form prepared by the Hon. Financial Secretary has been subjected to our thorough business and legal scrutiny, and is ready for the consideration of the General Body.

Members

RESIDENT

On the roll on 1-1-23.	New admissions.	Non-Res. become Resident.	Ceased to be Members.	Transferred to the Non-Res. list.	Died.	Number of Members on 1-1-24.
518	78	6	47	10	6	539

NON-RESIDENT

On the roll on 1-1-23.	New admissions.	Resident become Non-Res.	Ceased to be Members.	Transferred to the Res. list.	Died.	Number of Members on 1-1-24.
172	14	10	21	6	1	168

Of the 539 Resident Members, 41 are Life-Members and 75 are on the Absent list; and of the 168 Non-Resident Members, 12 are Life-Members and 8 are absent from India.

Obituary

The Committee regret to record the death of the following Members :—

Sir N. G. Chandavarkar.
Mr. E. M. Harwood.
Prof. Aga Abdul Rahim Khan.
Mr. P. J. Mead, I.C.S.
Mr. P. M. Nathoobhoy.
,, E. R. Nicholson.
,, D. P. Raval.

Papers read, and lectures delivered, before the Society

12th March 1923—The Unpublished Coins of the Gujarat Sultanat. By Prof. S. H. HODIVALA, M.A.

22nd March 1923—A Bibliographical Note on the Bhāsa Dramas. By Dr. V. S. SUKTHANKAR.

22nd March 1923—Two sets of Cālukyan Copper-plates from Navsārī. By G. V. ACHARYA, B.A.

20th April 1923—A Visit to the Great Wall of China : a similar Wall of King Noshirwān of Persia. By Shams-ul-ulma Dr. J. J. MODI, B.A., PH.D., C.I.E.

15th June 1923—Śākambharī (Sāmbhar) mentioned in the Durgā Sapta Śatī. By Mr. S. S. MEHTA, B.A.

A lecture, illustrated with lantern slides, on " H. R. H. the Prince of Wales's Big Game Shoot in the Nepal Terai " was delivered before the Society by Mr. B. C. ELLISON of the Bombay Natural History Society on 6th February 1923. His Excellency Sir George Lloyd presided on the occasion.

An address was given by Dr. M. WINTERNITZ of Prag University on " Mahābhārata Criticism, " at his reception by the Society on 11th October 1923.

An illustrated lecture on " Mughal Paintings " was delivered by Mr. O. C. GANGOLY, Editor of *Rūpam*, on 18th December. Members of the Bombay Art Society were invited to attend the lecture.

Library

The total number of volumes added was 1,858, of which 1,447 were purchased and 411 were presented.

Books presented to the Society were received, as usual, from the Government of India, the Government of Bombay, and other Provincial Governments, as well as from the Trustees of the Parsi Punchayet Funds, other public bodies and individual donors.

A meeting of the Society under Art. XXI of the Rules was held on the 21st of November for the purpose of revising the list

of the papers and periodicals received by the Society, and it was decided to omit the following from 1924 :—

(1) *Challenge*, (2) *Outlook*, (3) *Times Illustrated Weekly London*, (4) *Fort St. George Gazette*;

and to add the following from the same date :—

(1) *Amateur Photographer*, (2) *John O'London's Weekly*, (3) *Colour*, (4) *Nation* (American), (5) *Annual Weather Forecast* (Indian), (6) *Monthly Weather Review and Summary*, (7) *Commerce*.

The Journal Number

Indian and Foreign Chronology by Mr. V. B. KETKAR, which the Managing Committee had accepted for publication, was published as an Extra Number of the *Journal* during the year under review. The work was commended to the Society by Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, who recommended that some remuneration be given to the author for the work. The Managing Committee has voted Rs. 300 as honorarium to Mr. Ketkar.

Manuscript Catalogue

The Society had made a provision of Rs. 750 in last year's budget for starting the printing of the Manuscript Catalogue ; but no satisfactory arrangements for printing could be made during the year under report, though inquiries were made of several presses in India. It has now been decided to entrust the work to the Nirnaya Sagara Press of Bombay, and printing of the Catalogue will soon commence.

Coin Cabinet

Thirty-seven additions were made to the Coin Cabinet of the Society during the year under report. Out of these, 6 were gold, 26 silver and 5 copper.

EARLY SOUTH INDIAN

Gold

1	**Viraraya Fanam.**	*Bombay Government.*
1	**Deva Raya II of Vijayanagar.**	*C. P. Government.*

Gold

1	Anonymous	..	Obv. rude figure standing. Rev. blank.
1	Do.	..	Impression on both sides.
1	Do.	..	do. on one side.
1	Do.	..	Blank.

Bombay Government.

MUGHAL EMPERORS OF INDIA

Silver			*Mint.*
1	Jehangir	..	Ahmedabad.
1	Shah Jahan	..	Golkonda.
1	Do.	..	Barhanpur, 1037, Ahd.

C. P. Government.

1	Do.	..	Golkonda.
1	Do.	..	

Bombay Government.

			Mint.			Reg. year.
1	Aurangzeb	..	Golkonda	..		6
2	Do.	..	Itawa	..	1108	41
			,,	..	1113	46
1	Do.	..	Lahore	..	1110	32
4	Do.	..	Surat	..	1093	25
			,,	..	1094	26
			,,	..	1096	28
			,,	..	1117	49

C. P. Government.

1	Do.	..	Golkonda			
1	Do.	..	Surat	..	1080	
1	Do.	..	,,	..		
1	Shah Alam	..	,,	..		

Bombay Government.

2	Do.	..	Itawa	..	1120	2
			,,	..	1121	3
1	Do.	..	Lucknow	..		4
1	Muhammad Shah		Surat	..		3

C. P. Government.

3 Shah Alam II struck by Marathas.

2 Shah Alam II struck by E. I. Co.

Bombay Government.

BAHAMANI SULTANS

Copper.

1	Ahmad Shah.	Type VI
1	Humayun Shah.	,, XII
1	Mahomed Bin Humayun.	, XIII
2	Mahomed Shah II.	,, XIV & XV.

Bombay Government.

Disposal of the Treasure Trove Coins

There were 1,594 coins with the Society at the end of last year and 241 were received during 1923. The details of the latter are :—

Number of coins.	Metal.	From
2	Gold	Sirur (Dist. Poona.)
69	,,	Parner (Dist. Ahmadnagar.)
170	Silver	Niphad (Dist. Nasik.)

Out of the total of 1835 coins, 239 of 1922 were returned to the Mamlatdar of Kopergaum as being of no numismatic value, and the following 895 were distributed or otherwise disposed of under the orders of Government; thus leaving 701 coins with the Society awaiting examination or distribution.

Institution.	*Gold*	*Silver*	*Copper*
Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay	49	118	133
Indian Museum, Calcutta	4	8	0
Delhi Museum	0	23	0
Government Museum, Madras	10	12	5
Provincial Museum, Lucknow	1	0	0
Central Museum, Lahore	5	8	0
Central Museum, Nagpur	10	0	4
Shillong Coin Cabinet	4	10	5
Peshwar Museum	0	3	0
McMahon Museum, Quetta	10	5	5
Rajputana Museum, Ajmer	4	0	0
Phayre Provincial Museum, Rangoon	5	0	0
Dacca Museum	3	0	0
B. B. R. A. Society	10	11	5
British Museum	4	0	0
Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge	4	7	5

Durbar.	*Gold*	*Silver*	*Copper*
Akalkot	3	0	0
Bansda	1	1	0
Baroda	1	0	0
Bhavnagar	2	3	4
Cambay	2	2	4
Dholpur	1	0	3
Gwalior	1	0	0
Hyderabad	4	0	4
Idar	0	0	4
Indore	1	0	4
Jaipur	1	0	3
Jamkhindi	8	3	4
Jhalwar	1	0	4
Jind	1	0	0
Jodhpur	1	0	4
Kolhapur	4	3	4
Kotah	1	0	4
Lunvada	1	0	0
Mandi	1	0	2
Miraj	5	4	4
Mysore	1	0	0
Pudukkottai	1	0	3
Rutlam	0	0	4
Reva	1	0	0
Sangrur	0	0	3
Sirohi	1	0	4
Sitamau	1	0	4
Trivandrum	0	0	2
Vala	2	2	4
Sent to the Mint	2	0	262
	172	223	500

The Non-Mahomedan coins were examined by Mr. G. V. ACHARYA, B.A., and the Mahomedan by Mr. CH. MAHOMED ISMAIL, M.A., Assistant Curators, Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay. The Society's best thanks are due to these gentlemen for their kind assistance.

The Campbell Memorial Medal

The medal for 1923 has been awarded to Sir GEORGE GRIERSON in appreciation of the valuable services he has rendered

to Oriental research by the publication of the monumental work *Linguistic Survey of India.* Arrangements are being made to present the medal to Sir George Grierson.

The presentation of the special medal to Rao Bahadur P. B. JOSHI is mentioned above.

Accounts

Income.

A statement of accounts for 1923 is subjoined. The total amount of entrance fees was Rs. 1,785 and subscriptions Rs. 30,532 against Rs. 1,905 and Rs. 26,979 the previous year. The balance to the Society's credit in cash at Bank on 31st December was Rs. 5,965-2-1.

The Government Securities held by the Society, including those of the Premchand Raychand Fund and of the Catalogue Fund, are of the face value of Rs. 40,600.

The cost of books and periodicals is still on the same high level. Our purchase of new books for the period under review totalled Rs. 8,588-7-6 against Rs. 8,904-6-5 in the previous year.

Government was pleased to sanction Rs. 5,000 for shelving in 1923.

There is a decrease of Rs. 666-10-5 under " Interest." This is due to the death of one Trustee, and retirement of another, which caused delay in collection, and this will be adjusted in 1924 accounts.

Expenditure.

It was found possible to increase the allotment for the purchase of books by Rs. 1,000. No other items call for special mention.

It will be observed that in the budget for 1924 a provision is made for Provident Fund.

STATEMENTS

The Bombay Branch of

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements

	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
Balance 31st December 1922—		
Amount in the Savings Bank Account ..	2,022 14 1	
,, in the Current Account	136 9 8	
,, in hand	194 15 7	
		2,354 7 4
Entrance Fee	1,785 0 0	
Subscription of Resident Members	26,486 0 0	
,, of Non- Resident Members ..	4,046 0 0	
Government Contribution	4,200 0 0	
Sale proceeds of Journal Numbers and Folklore Notes	265 5 11	
,, of Annual Catalogue	47 6 0	
,, waste paper	56 5 0	
Interest on Government Securities	1,083 5 7	
		37,969 6 6
Govt. Grant for Shelving	5,000 0 0	
Subscription of Resident Life-Membership ..	500 0 0	
Catalogue Fund (sale and interest)	471 0 0	
Replacement	350 11 0	
		6,321 11 0
		46,645 8 10

We have examined the account books and vouchers, and have obtained satisfactory information and explanation on all points desired. In our opinion the accounts as drawn up show the true and correct state of the affairs of the Society.

KENNETH MACIVER,

A. B. AGASKAR,

Hon. Auditors.

the Royal Asiatic Society

from 1*st January to* 31*st December* 1923

	Rs. a. p.	Rs. a. p.
Books	8,588 7 6	
Subscription to Indian Newspapers, etc. ..	772 0 0	
,, to Foreign ,, ..	2,781 0 6	
Binding and Repairs	1,300 8 0	
Printing Charges	1,455 4 0	
,, Journal Number	1,633 4 0	
Office Establishment	15,011 1 5	
General Charges	1,087 5 9	
Stationery	1,261 1 0	
Postage	409 3 6	
Furniture and Shelving	3,127 12 0	
Insurance	523 12 0	
Electric Charges	853 9 1	
Annual Library Checking	500 0 0	
		39,304 4 9
Temporary Establishment	168 0 0	
Govt. Securities	458 2 0	
MSS. Catalogue	750 0 0	
		1,376 2 0
Balance (including Rs. 1,076-11-3 of the Catalogue Fund)—		
Amt. in the Current Account	490 6 11	
,, Saving Bank	5,267 7 8	
,, in hand	207 3 6	
		5,965 2 1
		46,645 8 10

Invested Funds of the Society.

Government Securities ..	@ $6\frac{1}{2}$ p. c. ..	1,100 0 0	
Do. do. ..	,, 5 p. c. ..	8,300 0 0	
Do. do. ..	,, $3\frac{1}{2}$ p. c. ..	25,700 0 0	
Premchand Roychand Fund.	,, $3\frac{1}{2}$ p. c. ..	3,000 0 0	
Catalogue Fund	,, 5 p. c. ..	2,500 0 0	
			40,600 0 0

The Society's property and collections have been insured for three Lakhs of rupees.

E. A. PARKER,
Hon. Secretary.

L. W. H. YOUNG,
Hon. Financial Secretary.

Bombay Branch of

Budget Esti-

INCOME.	Budget 1923. Rs.	a.	p.	Actuals 1923. Rs.	a.	p.	Budget 1924. Rs.	a.	p.
Entrance Fees	2,200	0	0	1,785	0	0	2,000	0	0
Subn. Resident Members ..	24,500	0	0	26,486	0	0	25,000	0	0
,, N. R. Members ..	4,500	0	0	4,046	0	0	4,000	0	0
Govt. Contribution	4,200	0	0	4,200	0	0	4,200	0	0
Sale of Journal Nos. ..	300	0	0	265	5	11			
,, of Annual Catalogue ..				47	6	0	480	0	0
,, of Waste Paper ..				56	5	0			
Interest	1,750	0	0	1,083	5	7	2,500	0	0
	37,450	0	0	37,969	6	6	38,180	0	0
Subn. Resident Life-Members.	....			500	0	0	....		
Catalogue Fund (Sale of Copies, &c.)	....			471	0	0	....		
Replacement	....			350	11	0	....		
Govt. Grant for Shelving ..	....			5,000	0	0	....		
Balance of the previous year :	2,354	7	4	2,354	7	4	5,965	2	1
	39,804	7	4	46,645	8	10	44,145	2	1

the Royal Asiatic Society

mates for 1924

EXPENDITURE.	Budget 1923.			Actuals 1923.			Budget 1924.		
	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
Books	7,500	0	0	*8,588	7	6	7,500	0	0
Subn. Periodicals, Foreign ..	2,800	0	0	2,781	0	6	3,000	0	0
,, ,, Indian ..	700	0	0	772	0	0	850	0	0
Printing	1,250	0	0	1,455	4	0	1,500	0	0
Journal Printing	2,500	0	0	1,633	4	0	2,500	0	0
Binding and Repairs	1,750	0	0	1,300	8	0	1,750	0	0
Office Establishment	15,600	0	0	15,011	1	5	16,335	0	0
Library Furniture and Shelving	2,000	0	0	3,127	12	0	3,000	0	0
General Charges	1,000	0	0	1,087	5	9	1,150	0	0
Stationery	750	0	0	1,261	1	0	900	0	0
Postage	500	0	0	409	3	6	500	0	0
Insurance	523	12	0	523	12	0	523	12	0
Electric Charges	600	0	0	853	9	1	450	0	0
Annual Library Checking ..	....			500	0	0	....		
Provident Fund Contribution .	....			....			1,353	0	0
	37,473	12	0	39,304	4	9	41,311	12	0
Temporary Establishment ..	....			168	0	0	720	0	0
Folklore Notes	538	0	0	....			950	0	0
Preparation of the MSS. Catalogue	950	0	0	750	0	0	200	0	0
Printing MSS. Catalogue ..	750	0	0	....			750	0	0
G. P. Notes	....			458	2	0	....		
	39,711	12	0	40,680	6	9	43,731	12	0
Balance ..	92	11	4	5,965	2	0	413	6	1
	39,804	7	4	46,645	8	10	44,145	2	1

* Rs. 1,000 was subsequently added to the budgeted amount by the Managing Committee.

The Campbell Memorial Fund

A Statement of Accounts ending 31st December 1922

	Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
Balance on 31-12-1921	353 11 7	Cost of a special Medal	265 0 0
Interest (less Bank Commission)	139 0 0	,, of 5% War Loan for Rs. 3,500 ..	3,017 15 0
Proceeds of 4% B. P. T. Loan..	3,000 0 0	Stamp, withdrawal fee, Deposit fee, etc. ..	11 10 0
		Balance (in the Bank)	198 2 7
Rs. ..	3,492 11 7	Rs. ..	3,492 11 7

Invested Funds :—

4% Terminable Loan	..Rs.	500
5% War Loan ..	.. ,,	3,500
	Rs.	4,000

The Campbell Memorial Fund

A Statement of Accounts ending 31st December 1923

	Rs. a. p.		Rs. a. p.
Balance on 31-12-1922 ..	198 2 7	Stamp on Debit slip	10 1 0
Interest	79 1 6	Balance (in the Bank)	267 3 1
Rs. ..	277 4 1	Rs. ..	277 4 1

Invested Funds :—

4% Terminable Loan	..Rs.	500
5% War Loan ..	.. ,,	3,500
	Rs.	4,000

Annual General Meeting

The Annual General Meeting of the Society was held on Tuesday, 18th March 1924.

Justice Sir Lallubhai A. Shah, President, in the Chair.

There were also present :—

Rev. Dr. R. Zimmermann.	Mr. G. A. Acharya.
Rao Bahadur P. B. Joshi.	,, S. V. Puntambekar.
Dr. P. N. Daruvala.	,, R. D. Choksi.
Prof. N. B. Divatia.	,, V. G. Bhandarkar.
Mr. V. P. Vaidya.	,, M. D. Altekar.
,, E. M. Ezekiel.	,, V. J. Nandkarni.
,, L. W. H. Young.	,, W. R. Kerkar.
,, J. E. Aspinwall.	,, B. K. Wagle.
,, O. H. Nazar.	,, J. C. Daruvala.
,, J. S. Sanzgiri.	,, G. V. Padgavkar.
,, S. V. Bhandarkar.	Rao Saheb M. S. Muzumdar.
,, K. H. Vakil.	Dr. E. A. Parker (*Hon. Sec.*)
,, D. D. Nanavati.	

The minutes of the last Annual General Meeting and of the General Meeting of 11th March 1924 were read and confirmed.

The Annual Report for 1923 with the statement of accounts, and the budget for 1924 having been taken as read,

Mr. S. V. Bhandarkar proposed that they be adopted, and

,, E. M. Ezekiel seconded the proposal.

Carried.

Mr. J. E. Aspinwall proposed and Mr. S. V. Bhandarkar seconded that the present Committee of Management, excepting Mr. Ch. Mahammad Ismail who had resigned, with the Honorary Secretary and the Hon. Financial Secretary be re-elected and that the following six new names be added to it.

Mr. A. Montgomerie, I.C.S.	Principal W. E. Gladstone Solomon.
,, J. E. B. Hotson, I.C.S.	Mr. P. M. D. Sanderson.
,, J. P. Brander, I.C.S.	,, L. S. Dabholkar.

Carried.

On the motion of Mr. K. H. Vakil, seconded by Mr. G. V. Acharya, Mr. S. V. Puntambekar's name was added to the Managing Committee.

Mr. V. P. Vaidya proposed that Mr. K. M. Jhaveri be elected member of the Managing Committee. Mr. E. M. Ezekiel seconded, and the proposal was carried.

Mr. J. S. Sanzgiri moved a hearty vote of thanks to Messrs. K. MacIver and A. B. Agaskar for their services in auditing the accounts of the Society for 1923, and proposed that they be re-elected Auditors for 1924.

Dr. P. N. Daruvala seconded. *Carried.*

Mr. S. V. Bhandarkar moved that the proposed rules and regulations of the Provident Fund Scheme be adopted.

Rev. Dr. R. Zimmermann seconded.

Mr. W. R. Kerkar moved the following amendment:—

(*a*) that in (*d*) of Rule I, substitute "Society" for "Fund" and "under the rules of the Society" for "as hereinafter provided."

(*b*) that the whole portion of Rule 5 from "The Society" to "such year" be deleted.

(*c*) that in line 7 of Rule 13 "application" be substituted for "cheque."

The amendment having been seconded by Mr. M. D. Altekar was put to vote and lost.

The rules were then adopted in the form proposed by the Managing Committee.

Mr. S. V. Bhandarkar proposed and Mr. E. M. Ezekiel seconded that Messrs. V. P. Vaidya and S. S. Patkar, two of the Trustees of the Society, be elected Trustees of the Fund under Article 5 of the scheme in addition to the Hon. Financial Secretary.

Carried.

The meeting then proceeded to elect Fellows of the Society.

The ballot paper, with 17 names thereon recommended by the Managing Committee, was distributed among the members, the names being :—

Dr. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar.
Dr. Heinrich Lüders.
Prof. Jadunath Sarkar.
Dr. Ganganath Jha.
Mr. Vasudeo Shastri Abhyankar.
Dr. Jivanji J. Modi.
Mr. V. P. Vaidya.
,, P. V. Kane.
Dr. P. N. Dhalla.
Sir George Grierson.
Mr. N. B. Divatia.
,, Vishvanath K. Rajvade.
Divan Bahadur L. D. Swamikannu Pillai.
Rev. Dr. D. Mackichan.
Rev. Dr. R. Scott.
Prof. Shaikh Abdul Kadir Sarfraz, and
Prof. S. H. Hodivala.

Rev. Dr. Zimmermann and Mr. L. W. H. Young were appointed to scrutinise the ballot papers.

On the report of the Scrutinisers, the President announced that all 17 were elected.

Printed by E. G. Pearson at the Times Press, Bombay, and published by
Dr. E. A. Parker, Hon. Secy., for the Bombay Branch,
Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay.—J. 4699·24.

THE PREDECESSORS OF VIJÑĀNEŚVARA

By P. V. Kane, M.A., LL.M.

The Mitaksara of Vijñāneśvara occupies a peculiar position in the legal literature of India. Under the decisions of British Courts in India, the Mitākṣarā is of paramount authority in matters of Hindu law in the whole of India, except in Bengal where the Dāyabhāga is supreme. The Mitākṣarā holds a position similar to that of the Mahābhāṣya of Patañjali in Grammar or the Kāvyaprakāśa of Mammaṭa in Poetics. It embodies in itself the results of centuries of legal speculation that preceded it and becomes in its turn a source of further exegesis and improvements. It is therefore interesting to see who the predecessors of Vijñāneśvara were, to find out what views were either originated or elaborated by them and to estimate the debt of Vijñāneśvara to his predecessors. In the following paper, no account is taken of the Smṛti writers that preceded Vijñāneśvara. Attention is centred only upon six writers who are named by the Mitākṣarā and who wrote either commentaries or *nibandhas* on the Dharmaśāstra. Those six writers are Asahāya, Viśvarūpa, Bhāruci, Medhātithi, Śrīkara, and Dhāreśvara. In the following M. and V. respectively stand for the Mitākṣarā and Vijñāneśvara.

Asahaya.

The M., in explaining the verse of Yājñavalkya (II. 124) that unmarried sisters are entitled to have their marriages celebrated by their brothers who are to give a fourth share to them, says that the explanation of Asahāya and Medhātithi of the words 'fourth share' stands to reason (*viz.*, that the sister gets a fourth of what her brother of the same class as herself gets) and not that of Bhāruci. The only work so far known as Asahāya's is his commentary on the Nāradasmṛti which was revised by Kalyāṇabhaṭṭa. Dr. Jolly's edition of the Nāradasmṛti (B. I. Series) contains a portion (*viz.*, up to the middle of the 5th chapter) of the revised version of Asahāya's *bhāṣya*. What liberties Kalyāṇa-

bhaṭṭa took with the *bhāṣya* of Asahāya on Nārada cannot be ascertained definitely. But he seems to have taken great liberties. On p. 9, verse 15 (of Nārada) 'rājā satpuruṣaḥ, &c.' the comment is 'Manu—Nārada—Viśvarūpātmakam.' If the Viśvarūpa mentioned here be identical with the commentator of Yājñavalkya (as is very probable), Asahāya could not have regarded him as of almost the same authority as Manu. Therefore the reference to Viśvarūpa must be due to Kalyāṇabhaṭṭa. The name of Kalyāṇabhaṭṭa is frequently cited in the commentary itself (*vide* pp. 81, 86, 89). The M. does not most likely refer to the *bhāṣya* of Asahāya on Nārada, but rather to Asahāya's *ṭīkā* on Manu, since the M. quotes Manu. IX. 118 which contains a rule similar to that of Yājñavalkya. From a passage of the Sarasvatīvilāsa[1] (para. 33 of Foulke's edition), it follows that Asahāya wrote a commentary on the Manusmṛti. This conclusion receives support from the fact that the Vivādaratnākara quotes the explanation of Asahāya on Manu. IX. 182 (bhrātṝṇām ekajātānām).[2] The Hāralatā of Aniruddha (who was the *guru* of Ballāla Sena of Bengal about 1168 A.D.) tells us that Asahāya composed a *bhāṣya* on the Dharmasūtra of Gautama.[3]

Thus it is almost certain that Asahāya wrote bhāṣyas on the Gautamadharmasūtra, the Manusmṛti and the Nāradasmṛti. His commentaries on the first two have not yet been traced. It is an irony of fate that the very name of such an important and ancient commentator should have been forgotten by later writers. The Bālambhaṭṭī in explaining the passage from the M. about Asahāya explains 'Asahāya' as an adjective of Medhātithi meaning independent.'

Dr. Jolly (*Tagore Law Lectures*, p. 5) thought that Asahāya was earlier than Medhātithi mainly on the ground that both V. and the Sarasvatīvilāsa place him before Medhātithi whenever autho-

---

[1] धर्मविभागो मनुयाज्ञवल्क्यादिस्मृतिकाराणां तत्स्मृतिव्याख्यातृणामसहायमेधातिथि-विज्ञानेश्वरापरार्काणां निबन्धॄणां चन्द्रिकाकाराणां च संमत एव ।

[2] अत्रासहायेनोक्तं पुंसां सति भ्रातृजे स्त्रीणां सपत्नीपुत्रे क्षेत्रजादयः प्रतिनिधयो न कर्तव्या इति ।

[3] हारलता (B. I. edition), p. 35 : गौतमः—बालदेशान्तरितप्रव्रजितानां सपिण्डानां सद्यः शौचम् (गौ. ध. सू. १४.४१) । यत्र मृतोऽशौचाभ्यन्तरे न श्रूयते तद्देशान्तरं तत्र मृतो देशान्तरित इति गौतमभाष्यकृताऽसहायेन व्याख्यातम् ।—*Vide* p. 97 also.

rities on topics of Vyavahāra are cited. It had escaped the notice of Dr. Jolly that Medhātithi in his comment on Manu 8. 155 (the verse 'adarśayitvā tatraiva') mentions Asahāya by name. The Sarasvatīvilāsa in one place mentions Asahāya after V. (para. 195), though before Medhātithi. It will be seen that Medhātithi flourished about 900 A.D. or a little later. Medhātithi does not name Viśvarūpa, though he cites Asahāya by name. Hence Asahāya is older than even Viśvarūpa and is certainly not later than about 800 A.D.

The views of Asahāya are not so freely quoted by any writer as by the Sarasvatīvilāsa. This shows that in the 16th century Asahāya's works were available. We saw above that V. agreed with Asahāya's view about the fourth share to be given to the unmarried sister. Some of the other views attributed to Asahāya may be collected here. The Sarasvatīvilāsa[4] tells us that the definition of *dāya* given by V. was identical with Asahāya's. Asahāya explained the *dictum* of Uśanas that fields were impartible by taking it to refer to the son of a Brāhmaṇa from a Kṣatriya wife[5]; such a son does not participate in land gifted to a Brāhmaṇa. V. on Yāj. II. 119) follows this explanation. Asahāya seems to have held that as regards succession to the *śulka* of a woman even step-brothers should be given something, though the major portion would go to the full brothers.[6] According to Asahāya the wealth of a childless Brāhmaṇa went to the teacher, then to the teacher's son, and then to the teacher's widow and then to the pupil, to the pupil's son, to the pupil's widow and then to the fellow-student.[7] The Vivādaratnākara (p. 578) quotes the Prakāśa as referring to the views of Asahāya and Medhātithi on the verse of Manu (IX. 198), that the special rule of Manu applies to all the *strīdhana* belonging

---

4 Para. 19: असहायविज्ञानयोगिप्रभृतीनां तु यत्स्वामिसंबन्धादेव निमित्रादन्यस्य स्वं भवति तद्दायशब्देनोच्यत इति।

5 Para. 195 of सरस्वतीविलास.

6 अतश्च कन्याशुल्कविषये सोदरासोदरविभागेऽसोदराणामपि किंचिद्देयमित्यसहाय-व्याख्यानमसहायम्। (Para. 314.)—There is a play on the word असहाय (which means 'unsupported, baseless').

7 सरस्वतीविलास, para. 608.

to a Kṣatriya woman who has a Brāhmaṇı co-wife.[8] The M. (on Yāj. II. 145) gives a similar rule.

[After the foregoing was written, the portion of Viśvarūpa's commentary on the prāyaścitta section (recently published) was received. On Yāj. III. 263-264 Viśvarūpa mentions Asahāya by name and cites the latter's explanation of a sūtra of Gautama (22. 13). This shows that Asahāya commented on the Gautama-dharmasūtra and flourished before Viśvarūpa, *i.e.*, before 800 A.D.]

VISVARUPA.

The commentary of Viśvarūpa called Bālakrīḍā on Yājñavalkya has been published at Trivandrum by Pandit Gaṇapatiśāstrī. M. states in the introductory verse that the work of Yājñavalkya was expanded by the voluminous (or ample, *vikaṭa*) words of Viśvarūpa. In commenting on Yāj. I. 81 M. tells us that Viśvarūpa understood the words 'tasmin yugmāsu saṁviśet' (in Yāj. I. 79) as laying down a *niyama*, while M. takes it to be a *parisaṁkhyā*. In Viśvarūpa's commentary this discussion occurs on verse 80 ('evaṁ gacchan'), where Viśvarūpa[9] quotes Manu. (III. 45) and Gautama. 5. 1 (ṛtāv upeyāt), cites the views of some (kecit) that Gautama's dictum is a *parisaṁkhyā* and then gives his own emphatic opinion that Gautama's words must be explained as containing a *niyama*. M. on Yāj. (III. 24) informs us that Viśvarūpa, Medhātithi and Dhāreśvara looked upon certain texts of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga and others on āśauca as in conflict with approved Smṛtis and discarded them.

The printed commentary of Viśvarūpa on the *vyavahāra* section is very meagre and hardly merits the epithet 'voluminous' applied to it by M., which is several times larger than Viśvarūpa's discourse on the same section. But the comment of Viśvarūpa on the *ācāra* portion is truly voluminous as compared with M. on the same section. The style of Viśvarūpa is simple and forcible and resembles that of Śaṅkara. He quotes profusely from the

8 पित्रा दत्तमिति स्त्रीधनमात्रोपलक्षणामत्यसहायमेधातिथिरिति(?थी इति)प्रकाशकारः (I)

9 गौतमीयं त्वनृतुपरिसंख्यार्थमृतावुपेयादिति केचित् । . . . तस्मात्तदपि नियमार्थमेव व्याख्येयम् ।

Vedic Saṁhitās, mentions the *carakas* and Vājasaneyins on Yāj. I. 32 and often supports his position by quotations from the Ṛgveda (*e.g.*, on Yāj. II. 121, and II. 206), from the Brāhmaṇas (*e.g.*, Śatapatha I. 8. 3. 6 on Yāj. I. 53) and from the Upaniṣads (*e.g.*, on II. 117 he quotes the well-known Chāndogya passage about the ordeal for theft and on I. 50 the Chāndogya passage II. 23. 10 about the three branches of *Dharma*). He very frequently quotes the Gṛhyasūtra of Pāraskara and less frequently that of Bhāradvāja and of Āśvalāyana. He cites a host of writers on Dharmaśāstra.[10] It is noteworthy that though he quotes scores of Sūtras from the Dharmasūtras of Āpastamba, Baudhāyana, Gautama, Vasiṣṭha, Śaṅkha, and Hārīta, he does not quote Viṣṇu anywhere in the sections on *ācāra* and *vyavahāra*. As Viśvarūpa's is perhaps the earliest extant commentary on a Dharmaśāstra work, it is of capital importance in checking the text of the ancient Dharmasūtras. Most of the quotations attributed to Svayambhū are found in the extant Manusmṛti, but the quotations ascribed to Bhṛgu are not so found. It is remarkable that most of the quotations from Bṛhaspati (even on such topics as repayment of debts, sureties, the rights of śūdrāputra) are in prose, only a few being in verse (*e.g.*, a verse about ordeals on Yāj. II. 117, a verse about the method of partition on Yāj. II. 153). It appears that Viśvarūpa had before him not only the prose work of the Bārhaspatya Arthaśāstra but also the versified Smṛti of Bṛhaspati and that he looked upon beoth as the compositions of the same author and made no distinction between them. He quotes (on Yāj. I. 328) a verse from Viśālākṣa, well-known writer on politics frequently quoted even by Kauṭilya. On Yāj. I. 307 Viśvarūpa refers to the Arthaśāstra of Uśanas along with that of Bṛhaspati. Kauṭilya, the famous author of the Arthaśāstra, is nowhere quoted by name. The learned editor of Viśvarūpa's work (in the Trivandrum Series) thinks (Intro. p. V) that Viśvarūpa took Bṛhaspati and Viśālākṣa as *ārṣa* writers long anterior and therefore well known to Yājñavalkya and used their *dicta* to supplement

---

10 The writers on धर्मशास्त्र named are :– अङ्गिरस्, आत्रेय, आपस्तम्ब, उशनस्, कात्यायन, गार्ग्य, वृद्धगार्ग्य, गौतम, जातूकर्ण (or °र्णि), दक्ष, नारद, पितामह, पुलस्त्य, बृहस्पति, बौधायन, भृगु, मनु, वृद्धमनु, यम, वृद्धयाज्ञवल्क्य, वासिष्ठ, व्यास, शङ्ख, शातातप, शौनक, संवर्त, स्वयम्भू, हारीत.

and support Yājñavalkya, while he omits Kauṭilya's name because he thought Kauṭilya to be posterior to Yājñavalkya. This argument is most fallacious from several points of view. In the first place this argument is wrong because Viśvarūpa quotes verses from Nārada and Kātyāyana to supplement Yājñavalkya. No one can in these days regard the Smṛtis of Nārada and Kātyāyana as anterior to that of Yājñavalkya, nor is there anything to show that Viśvarūpa regarded them as anterior. Further it is possible that Kauṭilya's work was not available to Viśvarūpa. Moreover as Kauṭilya himself looked upon Bṛhaspati and Viśālākṣa as ancient authorities, Viśvarūpa might have naturally quoted from them rather than from Kauṭilya. That Kauṭilya flourished several centuries before Viśvarūpa follows from the express references contained in the works of Kāmandaka, Daṇḍin and Bāṇa. Therefore even granting that Kauṭilya was later than Yājñavalkya it is extremely doubtful whether Viśvarūpa was in possession of the exact chronological position of the two writers. Chronology has never been a strong point with any Indian commentator. Besides the very foundation of the whole argument is shaky as it is based upon premises that are not accepted by many Sanskrit scholars, who place Kauṭilya long before Yājñavalkya. It appears, however, that Viśvarūpa impliedly refers to Kauṭilya's work in several places. For example, on Yāj. I. 307 he speaks of ministers tested by the four allurements (*upadhā*) of dharma, artha, kāma and bhaya. This is an echo of Kauṭilya (I. chap. 10). On Yāj. I. 344 Viśvarūpa refers to the views of some about marching in case of calamities of neighbouring chiefs, which agree with those of Kauṭilya.[11] In the comment of Yāj. I. 341 Viśvarūpa speaks of the manifold aspects of the work of a minister, some words of which agree very closely with Kauṭilya.[12]

---

[11] तथा चाहु: सामन्तयोर्व्यसनसाम्ये न यातव्यं तममित्रमेव यायादिति। विश्वरूप. Cf. तुल्यसामन्तव्यसने यातव्यममित्रं वा इत्यमित्रमभियायात्। कौटिल्य (VII. chap. 5)

[12] किं पुनस्तन्मन्त्रणीयम्। उक्तं च दिक्प्रचारदूतसंप्रेषणकापटिकोदास्थितगृहपतिकवैदेहकतापसव्यञ्जनावस्थितचारप्रपञ्चपरिनिरूपणपरप्रयुक्तकापटिकाद्युच्छेददुर्गादिकरणकन्यासंप्रदानकुमारचिन्तान्तःपुरप्रचाराद्यनेकविधं च। विश्वरूप. The words कापटिको . . . व्यञ्जन occur in कौटिल्य(I. chap. 11), कौटिल्य has chapters on राजपुत्ररक्षण (*i.e.* कुमारचिन्ता), अवरुद्धवृज (*i.e.* अन्तःपुरप्रचार), दुर्गविधान, दूतप्रणिधि

Viśvarūpa is thoroughly saturated with the lore of the Pūrva-mīmāṁsā. On Yāj. I. 225 he quotes Jaimini by name (Pūrvam. VI. 8.15 is quoted). It is curious to note that he applies the term Nyāya to Mīmāṁsā. In explaining Yāj. I. 3 (about the fourteen *vidyās*) he says 'nyāya-mīmāṁsā' is one *vidyā*, while others explain 'nyāya' as the system of logic propounded by Akṣapāda. He quotes the *sūtras* of Jaimini as those of *Yājñikas* who know *nyāya*[13] (*e.g.*, on Yāj. I. 53 he quotes Jaimini I. 3. 16 and on I. 87 he quotes Jaimini VI. 8.17). He applies the epithet *naiyāyika* to a mīmāṁsaka like Śabara[14] on Yāj. I. 58. He quotes the Ślokavārtika (I. 12) of Kumārila in his introductory remarks (p. 2, the verse 'sarvasyaiva hi' etc.). In his comment on Yāj. I. 7 he quotes over fifty verses (in the nature of *Kārikās*) dealing with the relation of Śruti and Smṛtis and kindred topics. These verses are his own composition, as in one of them he assures us that a certain point will be dealt with by him in detail in the section on Śrāddha.[15] In numerous cases he relies upon or discusses the maxims of Mīmāṁsā. On Yāj. I. 4-5 he discusses the rule of Mīmāṁsa II. 4. 8. 32 (about 'sarvaśākhāpratyam ekaṁ karma') in its application to Smṛtis. On I. 225 he relies upon the position that words like *yava, varāha* are to be taken as used in the Vedas in the same sense in which śiṣṭas use them (Pūrvam. I. 3. 9). On II. 144 he speaks of dravya (wealth) being *puruṣārtha.* He here alludes to the well-known distinction between *puruṣārtha* and *kratvartha* (Pūrvam. chap. IV).

There is a slight discrepancy in the number of verses commented upon by Viśvarūpa and V. For example, on I. 194 Viśvarūpa remarks that some read the verse 'rathyākardamatoyāni' after it, but that it is redundant. M. comments on this verse. Viśvarūpa comments on a verse 'āgamena viśuddhena bhogo yāti pramāṇatām' after Yāj. II. 28, which is passed over by the Mitākṣarā. This verse is found in the Nāradasmṛti and is ascribed to him by the Vyavahāramayūkha and other digests. There are many

---

[13] न्यायविदश्च याज्ञिकाः 'अपि वा सर्वधर्मः स्यात्' etc.; न्यायविदश्च याज्ञिकाः सर्वार्थत्वात् पुत्रार्थे न प्रयोजयेदित्याहुः।

[14] तथा च नैयायिका नाहि वचनस्यातिभारोस्तीत्याहुः। These words occur in शबरभाष्य on III. 2. 3.

[15] p. 16 : सर्वं चैतत्प्रपञ्चेन वक्ष्यामः श्राद्धसंग्रहे ।

various readings sown broadcast over the whole work (*vide* com. on Yāj. I. 1, 2, 51, 63, 155; II. 119, 179, etc.). Some of these various readings are important. Viśvarūpa reads 'pitā mātāmaho bhrātā' (in Yāj. I. 63), while he notices the reading 'pitāmpitā aho.' that is adopted by M. He reads 'asvattaṁ lokavidviṣṭam' (in Yāj. I. 155) and notices a reading 'asvantam,' while M. reads 'asvargyaṁ loka°'. In several places Viśvarūpa suggests several meanings of the same verses and phrases (*e.g.*, I. 265; II. 41, 47, 160, 173). In numerous places Viśvarūpa cites the explanations of his predecessors about the text of Yājñavalkya (*e.g.*, I. 3, 25, 155, 169, 252; II. 21, 119, 121, 193). All these circumstances lead unmistakably to the conclusion that there is a gap of several centuries between Yājñavalkya and Viśvarūpa.

In the works of Jīmūtavāhana (*viz.*, the Vyavahāramātṛkā edited by Sir Asutosh Mukerji and the Dāyabhāga), in the Smṛticandrikā, in the Sarasvatīvilāsa and other works, the views of Viśvarūpa are frequently cited. Some of these quotations may be examined here.

(1) The Dāyabhāga (p. 145 of the edition of 1829) says[16] that the verse of Yāj. (II. 149 'aprajastrīdhanam') refers, according to Viśva. to *strīdhana* acquired at the time of marriage. The words of Viśva. on the verse ('brāhmādivivāhacatuṣṭaye yat strīdhanam') appear to convey the same view, though not quite clearly.

(2) The Dāyabhāga says (p. 188) that Viśva. regarded as exclusive property what was acquired by a man without employing paternal wealth just like dowry at a marriage.[17] Viśva. gives the same rule on Yāj. II. 122; but it is to be noted that the last few words in the Dāyabhāga which are meant to be a direct quotation from Viśva. are not found in the printed text.

(3) The Dāyabhāga says (p. 148) that Viśvarūpa's view that the *strīdhana* of a childless woman given to her by her parents

---

16 अतो विवाहकाललब्धस्त्रीधनविषयं ब्राह्मादिवचनमिति विश्वरूपोक्तमादरणीयम् ।

17 अत एवोक्तं विश्वरूपेण पितृद्रव्यं दत्त्वा यदि नोपार्जितं धनं तदा तस्यैवासाधारणं वैवाहिकवदेवोक्तं न तु भक्षणाद्युपभोगमात्रेण तस्य स्तनपानादितुल्यत्वादित्यन्तेन । दायभाग; पितृधनानुपघातेन यदन्यदर्जितं तथा मैत्रमौद्वाहिकं च तदार्जयितुरेव । . . . पितृद्रव्योपघातेनापि मैत्राद्यविभाज्यमेवारम्भसामर्थ्यात् । अन्ये तु मैत्रादिकमेव पितृधनानुपघातार्जितमविभाज्यमिच्छन्ति । . . . तन्तु सामान्यद्रव्यसाध्यत्वाद्विवाहस्यायुक्तमेव । विश्वरूप.

married in any of the eight forms from Brāhma to Paiśāca goes to the brother should be accepted.[18] Viśvarūpa (on Yāj. II. 148) says that *strīdhana* given by a woman's father and other relations, Śulka and Anvādheya are taken by her brothers if she dies childless and makes no reference to any particuar form of marriage. It is for this that the Vīramitrodaya (p. 704) says that Viśvarūpa and Jīmūtavāhana held the view that what a woman obtained from her parents when a maiden goes to her brother.

(4) The Dāyabhāga (p. 284) says that Viśvarūpa, Jitendriya, Bhojadeva and Govindarāja assigned a place as an heir to the daughter's son after the daughter. Viśvarūpa in commenting upon Yāj. II. 138 that the illegitimate son of a Śūdra takes the whole estate in the absence of a legitimate son and daughter's son uses this verse as indicating that among the three higher castes the daughter's son inherits.[19]

(5) The Dāyabhāga informs us (p. 296) that Viśvarūpa and Śrīkara placed the half-brother after the full brother and before the brother's son.[20]

(6) The Vyavahāramātṛkā of Jīmūtavāhana (p. 319) says that Viśvarūpa's explanation that even one person approved of by both sides is a proper witness should be accepted. Viśvarūpa propounds this view on Yāj. II. 74.

(7) The Vyavahāramātṛkā (p. 334) says that according to Viśvarūpa if the witnesses of a party depose to more or less than what the party asserts in his plaint, then, as the sages declare, it amounts to no proof. Viśvarūpa[21] holds this view and cites an ancient text to that effect on Yāj. II. 81. The Vyavahāra-

---

[18] सर्वदापदेन (in the text of वृद्ध कात्यायन 'पितृभ्यां चैव यद्दत्तं दुहितुः स्थावरं धनम्। अप्रजायामतीतायां भ्रातुगामि तु सर्वदा') ब्राह्मादिपैशाचान्तविवाहिताया अप्रजसो धनं भ्रातृगाम्येव भवतीति विश्वरूपोक्तमादरणीयम्।

[19] अस्मादेव च दौहित्राभाववचनाद् द्विजातीनामपि पुत्राभावे दौहित्रा धनभाज इति। विश्वरूप.

[20] भ्रातरस्तथेति तथाशब्दः प्रकारार्थः सापत्नादिसर्वभ्रातृसंग्राहकः। विश्वरूप on याज्ञ. II. 139.

[21] विश्वरूपस्य मते ऊनाधिकाराभिधाने तदयुक्त (?तदप्यनुक्त) मिति मुनिभिरभिहितत्वात् etc.। व्यवहारमातृका; बह्वर्थप्रतिज्ञायां च न्यूनमभ्यधिकं चार्थं प्रब्रूयुर्यत्र साक्षिणः। तदप्यनुक्तं विज्ञेयमेषसाक्ष्यविधिः स्मृतः—इति। अतः कृत्स्नप्रतिज्ञातार्थसत्यत्वे एव ध्रुवो जयः।

tattva of Raghunandana says that Viśvarūpa does not require that the single witness must be 'dharmavid.' As a matter of fact that word, though occurring in Yāj. II. 74, is passed over by Viśva.

(8) The Vyavahāramatṛkā (p. 346) says that the purport of Yāj. II. 24 (paśyato' bruvato) according to Viśva. is simply to censure a man's acquiescence in or indifference to (trespass on his own land) and that the period of twenty years is mentioned in the verse for precluding the possibility of challenging a document (of sale, etc.) after twenty years. The first of these positions is contained in the printed Viśvarūpa[22] but not the second. It is noteworthy that M. on the same verse introduces the same two positions with the words 'atha matam' and disapproves of them, just as Jīmūtavāhana does.

(9) The Smṛticandrikā (Gharpure's edition, II, p. 294) says that according to the Saṅgrahakāra a widow could succeed to her husband's wealth if she submitted to Niyoga, that the same was the opinion of Dhāreśvara and that Viśvarūpa has well refuted the view of Dhāreśvara. In the printed Viśvarūpa there is no discussion on this point. But from the fact that Viśvarūpa takes the word 'patnī' in Yāj. II. 139 to mean a widow pregnant at the time of her husband's death and that Viśvarūpa forbids Niyoga to Brāhmaṇa women, it may be said that he disapproved of the views similar to those of Dhāreśvara.

(10) The Smṛticandrikā (II, p. 300) says that the Saṅgrahakāra placed the father's mother as an heir after the mother and before the father, that the views of Saṅgrahakāra proceeded on the same arguments as those advanced by Dhāreśvara and that Viśvarūpa and others have refuted those arguments. Viśvarūpa places the father after the mother. But there is hardly any argument in the printed text, which does mention the verse of Manu. IX. 217 about the '*pitāmahī*' and which is rather corrupt.

(11) The Smṛticandrikā (II, p. 266) says that according to Viśvarūpa a special share to the eldest son on partition is not

---

[22] उपेक्षानिषेधमात्रं चैतत् । हानिवचनं तु निन्दामात्रत्वेनोपेक्षकस्य व्यवहारप्रवृत्त्ययोग्यतामात्रज्ञप्तिफलम् ।

given, now as it is opposed to the usage of Śiṣṭas, just as nobody offers a big bull or a goat to a learned guest in spite of the ancient texts[23] laying down the offering of a big bull, etc. The opinion here ascribed to Viśvarūpa cannot be found in one place in the printed text, but the following points may be considered. Viśvarūpa on Yāj. II. 121 distinctly states that 'uddhāra' (as laid down in Manu. IX. 112) can only take place with the consent of all the brothers. On Yāj. I. 155 he cites the views of some that the word 'loka-vidviṣṭa' in Yāj. implies cow-killing, which is abhorred by all peole. He does not approve of this as he says on that interpretation the vidhi about '*govadha*' would be purposeless. On pp. 25-26 of the printed text he discusses the question of 'govadha' prescribed by the Vedic and Smṛti texts (such as Manu. III. 3) in relation to Śiṣṭācāra. But his opinion seems to be the opposite of what is ascribed to him by the Smṛticandrikā. It is not unlikely that the latter work misunderstands him.

(12) The Hāralatā (p. 123) says that Viśvarūpa explained the word 'atrivarṣasya' in Manu V. 70 as meaning a child that has not completed its third year and that that explanation is in conflict with the word 'jātadantasya.' On Yāj. III. 1. Viśvarūpa does quote Manu V. 70 and explains 'atrivarṣasya' in the way the Hāralatā points out. The same work (p. 174) declares on the authority of Viśvarūpa, Govindarāja and the Kāmadhenu a certain verse as apocryphal.

(13) The Vyavahāramātṛkā[24] (p. 308) says that Viśvarūpa explained the verse of Yāj. (II. 17) as applying to a gift and the like[24]. But the printed Viśvarūpa contains no reference to 'gift' in the comment on this verse and seems to take the word 'pūrvavādin' as meaning the plaintiff.

(14) The Smṛticandrikā says (II, p. 122) that a certain verse prescribing gradually rising fines for the first, second and subsequent stages of a lawsuit is established by Viśvarūpa to be

---

23 यत्पुनर्विश्वरूपेणोक्तं यथा महोक्षं वा महाजं वा श्रोत्रियायोपकल्पयेत् इत्यस्य शिष्टाचारेण बाधितत्वादकरणमेवमुद्धारस्यापीति।

24 विश्वरूपेणापि साक्षिणः पूर्ववादिन इत्यादि प्रतिग्रहादिविषयं व्याख्यातं तत्रैव पूर्वबलवत्त्वात्।

unauthoritative.[25] This topic cannot be traced in the printed text.

(15) The Dāyabhāga[26] tells us (p. 350) that Viśvarūpa declared that if a co-parcener concealed some joint property and it was afterwards discovered, he was not guilty as a thief. A corresponding remark could not be traced in the printed Viśvarūpa. It is to be noted that M. on Yāj. II. 126 ('anyonyāpahṛtam') holds a contrary view.

Later writers frequently quote the views of Viśvarūpa. For example, Kullūka on Manu. II. 189, V. 68 and other places does so. But considerations of space forbid any further treatment of this matter.

The foregoing examination of quotations from comparatively early works ascribing certain views to Viśvarūpa establishes that in the main the printed text of the latter is authoritative, though in a few cases there are grounds to hold that it is corrupt or deficient.

In certain cases later commentators were mislead into ascribing certain views to Viśvarūpa. For example, the Bālambhaṭṭī often regards the words of M. 'the ācārya does not approve of this' as referring to Viśvarūpa, when really the word 'ācārya' refers to Yājñavalkya. On Yāj. I. 68-69 M. cites the views of the ācāryas that the verses refer to a girl who is only betrothed and not married. The Bālambhaṭṭī says that Viśva. is referred to. But in the printed Viśvarūpa, this view of the matter is ascribed to others. Similarly on Yāj. II. 80, the Bālambhaṭṭī ascribes the words 'tad apy ācāryo nānumanyate' to Viśvarūpa. But there is not a word of explanation in Viśvarūpa on this verse. On the verse 'patnī duhitarś caiva,' M. cites the view of some that if the wealth left by the deceased be equal to or less than what is required for maintenance, then the widow takes it in preference to the brothers and if it be more than what is necessary for maintenance, then the brothers take the rest. Then M. says this view also the revered (bhagavān) ācārya cannot tolerate. Both the Subodhinī and

25 यत्तु स्मृत्यन्तरं। आद्ये तु दण्डपादस्य द्वितीयेऽर्धं तृतीयके। पादन्यूनं चतुर्थे च पादे संपूर्णदण्डभाक्॥ तद्विगीतत्वादप्रमाणमिति प्रपञ्चितं विश्वरूपाचार्येण।

26 तदुक्तं विश्वरूपेणापि तस्करदोषो नास्तीति वचनारम्भसामर्थ्यात् स्तेयधात्वर्थानिष्पत्तेरित्यभिप्रायः।

Bālambhaṭṭī say that ācārya here means Viśvarūpa. Viśvarūpa does not say a word about this view on this verse. The word 'ācārya' is applied to Yājñavalkya by Viśvarūpa also (as in his comment on I. 2, 9, 22; II. 136, 288).

Viśvarūpa quotes Śabara and the Ślokavārtika of Kumārila and therefore he is later than the first half of the 8th century A.D. He is referred to as an authority by M. (about the end of the 11th century), so Viśvarūpa must have flourished between 700 A.D. and 1050 A.D. According to the Smṛticandrikā (*vide* Nos. 9 and 10) Viśvarūpa refuted certain views held by Dhāreśvara. Relying on this Rai Bahadur M. M. Chakravarti (*JASB.* for 1912, p. 345 and *JASB.* for 1915, p. 322) holds that Viśvarūpa is later than Bhojadeva. But this does not seem to be right. It has been shown above that the printed Viśvarūpa contains no express mention of Dhāreśvara and contains hardly any refutation. It is likely that Dhāreśvara adopted certain views that were long current before his time and that later writers knowing only the two works and not their predecessors regarded Viśvarūpa as having criticised Dhāreśvara and not his predecessors. The Smṛticandrikā was composed after 1200 A.D. and it is too much to suppose that it correctly knew the chronological position of the two writers. Later writers often invert the chronological positions of early predecessors. For example, the Sarasvatīvilāsa often cites the views of M. and then says that Bhāruci and others do not approve of (or tolerate) those views. Similarly in para. 392 it says that on a certain point Dhāreśvara and Devasvāmin follow the views of V. But we know from M. itself that Bhāruci and Dhāreśvara preceded the Mitākṣarā. Hence the Smṛticandrikā cannot be relied upon as an unimpeachable authority. A greater approximation as to the date of Viśvarūpa can be arrived at by holding Sureśvara and Viśvarūpa as identical. That they are identical may be regarded as tolerably certain. Eminent writers often connect the well-known works of Sureśvara, a pupil of the great Śaṅkarācārya, with Viśvarūpācārya. For example, in the Parāśaramādhava (Bombay Sanskrit Series, vol. I, part 1, p. 57), a verse from the Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad-bhāṣya-vārtika of Sureśvara (I. 1. 97) is ascribed to

Viśvarūpa.[27] In the Puruṣārthaprabodha of Brahmānanda Bhāratī (MS. in the Bhau Daji collection, Bombay Asiatic Society) composed in 1476 (probably Śaka) the Naiṣkarmyasiddhi, a work of Sureśvara, is ascribed to Viśvarūpa.[28] Maṇḍanamiśra is said to have been a pupil of Śaṅkara. Śaṅkara's traditional date is 788-820 A.D. Therefore Viśvarūpa *alias* Sureśvara flourished at the latest about the close of the 8th century A.D. It is rather far-fetched though not impossible to suppose that nearly about the same time there were two Viśvarūpas, one the author of Naiṣkarmyasiddhi and the other the author of the Bālakrīḍā. The profound knowledge of the Mīmāṁsā displayed in the Bālakrīḍā points to the identity of the two authors, but the whole question is further complicated by another circumstance. The learned editor of Viśvarūpa (in the Trivandrum Series), while speaking of the three commentaries on the Bālakrīḍā, quotes a verse from one of them which identifies Bhavabhūti (the dramatist), Sureśa and Viśvarūpa.[29] The editor does not take Bhavabhūti as a proper name, but only as an adjective of Sureśa. But this seems far-fetched. We know that in a MS. of the Mālatīmādhava, the drama is ascribed to Umbeka, a pupil of Kumārila (*vide* Intr. to Gauḍavaho, p. 206). So Bhavabhūti was regarded as a pupil of Kumārila and he was also called Umbeka. Umbeka wrote a commentary on the Ślokavārtika of Kumārila (*vide* the Yuktisnehaprapūraṇī on the Śāstradīpikā (first verse), where Umbeka's explanation on the first verse of the Ślokavārtika is cited). The Citsukhī (p. 265 of the Nirnayasagara ed.) seems to identify both Bhavabhūti and Umbeka and the commentator expressly says so. So the result of this whole tangle would be to hold that the same individual bore five names, Bhavabhūti, Umbeka, Maṇḍanamiśra, Sureśvara, Viśvarūpa. This is surely more than one can easily believe. It looks probable that there is some mistake here. Both Bhava-

---

[27] इदं च वाक्यं नित्यकर्मविषयत्वेन वार्तिके विश्वरूपाचार्य उदाजहार। आम्रे फलार्थे इत्यादि ह्यापस्तम्बस्मृतेर्वचः। फलवत्वं समाचष्टे नित्यानामपि कर्मणाम्। पराशरमाधवीय. The sūtra आम्रे फलार्थे is आपस्तम्बधर्म. I. 7. 20. 3.

[28] इत्येवं नैष्कर्म्यसिद्धौ ब्रह्म शैर्ब्रह्मवित्तमैः। श्रीमद्भिर्विश्वरूपाख्यैराचार्यैः करुणार्णवैः॥ पुरुषार्थप्रबोध (folio 6).

[29] यत्प्रसादादयं लोको धर्ममार्गस्थितः सुखी। भवभूतिसुरेशाख्यं विश्वरूपं प्रणम्य तम्॥

bhūti and Maṇḍanamiśra were probably the pupils of Kumārila. The first also was called Umbeka and the latter Sureśvara or Viśvarūpa. Through lapse of time and through their relation to Kumārila confusion was caused.

The M. holds an elaborate discussion on the question whether ownership arises on partition or whether there is partition of what is owned (jointly with others). Viśvarūpa does not contain an elaborate discourse on this topic, but in his introduction to Yāj. II. 124 he refers to these views and finally gives as his own opinion that there is partition of what is already (jointly) owned.[30]

There are great divergences of views between M. and Viśvarūpa. They are too numerous to be set forth here in detail. A few interesting points of difference are briefly discussed below. It has already been seen that they differ as to the interpretation of Yāj. I. 78-80.

(1) Viśvarūpa allows the father unrestricted freedom of distribution of ancestral property among his sons during his lifetime (on Yāj. II. 118 vibhāgam etc., etc.), while M. allows unrestricted freedom only as to self-acquired property.

(2) Viśvarūpa allows a share to the widows of deceased sons and grandsons of a man when a partition takes place in his life-time, while M. restricts the word 'patnyaḥ' to the father's own wives when he effects a partition in his lifetime. In this one respect Viśvarūpa is more liberal to women than M. In other cases he is not so liberal as V. towards the rights of women.

(3) Viśvarūpa connects the words 'without detriment to paternal estate' with the words 'whatever else is acquired by himself' and not with 'maitra' (gifts from a friend) and 'audvāhika' (gifts on marriage), while M. connects the half verse 'whatever else is acquired by a man himself without detriment to the paternal estate' with 'maitra,' 'audvāhika' and two more kinds mentioned in the verse 'kramād abhyāgatam.'

(4) Viśvarūpa places the verse 'kramād abhyāgatam' after the verse 'vibhakte'pi savarṇāyāḥ' and takes it to mean that if one member of a family recovers with his own exertions after

[30] अथ किं विभागात्स्वत्वमुत । स्वत्वे सति विभाग इति । विभागात्स्वत्वमित्याहुः । ... अतः स्वत्वे सति विभाग इति सिद्धम् ।

partition ancestral property lost to the family, he has not to give a share of it to the member (his own brother) who is born after partition, when the partition is reopened on account of his birth after partition. M. takes the verse immediately after 'pitṛdravyāvirodhena' and as laying down two varieties of self-acquired property. The arrangement of the M. appears better.

(5) Viśvarūpa allows Niyoga only to Śūdras as a general rule and to Kṣatriyas in case of danger of extinction of the line (on Yāj. I. 69 and II. 131), while M. forbids Niyoga in general and takes the texts speaking of it as applicable to a girl who is only betrothed and not married.

(6) Viśvarūpa allows one share out of ten to the son of a Śūdrā from a Brāhmaṇa without restriction of any kind, while M. restricts the share to estate other than land acquired by gift.

(7) Viśvarūpa interprets the expression 'half share' with reference to the illegitimate son of a Śūdra as meaning 'some portion, not necessarily exact half,' while M. interprets it literally.

(8) Viśvarūpa allows a widow to succeed to her deceased husband only if she is pregnant, *i.e.*, he restricts the meaning of the word 'patnī,' while M. allows a widow to succeed without any restriction.

(9) Viśvarūpa takes the word 'duhitaraḥ' to mean 'putrikā' and so does not allow all daughters to succeed, while M. introduces no such qualification.

(10) Viśvarūpa reads 'anyodaryasya saṁsṛṣṭī' for 'anyodaryas tu' and 'sodaro' for 'saṁsṛṣṭo' and his interpretation of Yāj. II. 139 is quite different from that of M.

(11) Viśvarūpa reads 'ādhivedanikaṁ caiva' for 'ādhivedanikādyaṁ ca' of M. and holds that Bandhudatta, Śulka and Anvādheyaka strīdhana of a childless woman goes on her death to her full brother; while M. connects the three with the preceding verse as kinds of strīdhana and takes the half verse 'atītāyām aprajasi' as laying down a general rule of succession to strīdhana of all kinds, and interprets 'bāndhavāḥ' as meaning 'husband and the rest.'

(12) Both differ in the interpretation of the term 'anvādheyaka.'

(13) Viśvarūpa takes the verse 'adhivinnastriyai' as applicable to a wife superseded without any prescribed ground for supercession; while M. does not introduce any such qualification.

BHARUCI.

V. on Yāj. (I. 81) says that Bhāruci, like Viśvarūpa, held that the rule 'ṛtau gacchet' was a niyama and not a parisaṁkhyā. On Yāj. II. 124 M. says that the explanation of the 'fourth share' to be given to unmarried sisters offered by Asahāya and Medhātithi was the proper one and not that of Bhāruci. The Parāśaramādhavīya (vol. III, part 2, p. 510) and the Sarasvatīvilāsa (para. 133) inform us that Bhāruci was of opinion that unmarried sisters were only entitled to a provision for their marriage and that they were not entitled to a fourth share.

Bhāruci being mentioned by the M. is certainly older than 1050 A.D. Rāmānuja in his Vedārthasaṅgraha (reprint from the *Pandit*, edition of 1924, p. 154) mention six Ācāryas that preceded him as upholders of the Viśiṣṭādvaita system, *viz.* Bodhāyana, Ṭaka, Dramiḍa, Guhadeva, Kapardi and Bhāruci. Similarly the Yatīndramatadīpikā of Śrīnivāsadāsa (Ānandāśrama ed.) enumerates (p. 2) the following teachers as the predecessors of Rāmānuja in propounding the Viśiṣṭādvaita system, *viz.*, Vyāsa, Bodhāyana, Guhadeva, Bhāruci, Brahmānandin, Draviḍārya, Śrīparāṅkuśa, Nāthamuni and Yāmunamuni. Vyāsa is the reputed author of the Vedāntasūtras, Bodhāyana is said to have composed a vṛtti on the Vedāntasūtras, Dramiḍa (or Draviḍa) is credited with a bhāṣya on the Vedāntasūtras (which is quoted by Rāmānuja on II. 2.3). Nāthamuni preceded Yāmuna. Yāmunācārya was born about 916 A.D. Rāmānuja refers to him with great reverence as *paramaguru* (*vide* Vedārthasaṅgraha, p. 149) and is said to have been young when Yāmuna died (*vide JRAS* for 1915, p. 147, and *Ind. Ant.* for 1909, p. 129). It is therefore obvious that the series of writers on the Viśiṣṭādvaita is arranged in chronological order by the Yatīndramatadīpikā. Hence Bhāruci must have been a comparatively ancient author on the Viśiṣṭādvaita, being earlier than even Dramiḍa, Nāthamuni and Yāmuna. He could not have flourished later than the first half of the 9th century. How

much earlier he flourished it is impossible to say. It is difficult to believe that there were two different writers of the same name nearly about the same time. Hence Bhāruci the writer on Dharma and Bhāruci the Viśiṣṭādvaita philosopher must be held to have been identical. If the identity of the two be accepted, then Bhāruci the writer on Dharmaśāstra becomes comparatively an early writer, being at least as old as (if not older than) Viśvarūpa. It will be seen that he and Viśvarūpa agree on several points (as above on the question of Niyama and below Nos. 5, 7, 9) and therefore it is not too much to suppose that he flourished at or about the time when the views found in Viśvarūpa's work were in vogue.

There is one interesting point to be noted about Bhāruci. From numerous notices contained in the Sarasvatīvilāsa it appears that Bhāruci either commented upon the Viṣṇudharmasūtra or took great pains to incorporate explanations of several sūtras of Viṣṇu in his work. For example, para. 637 of the Sarasvatīvilāsa tells us that Bhāruci explained the word 'bīja' occurring in a sūtra of Viṣṇu as 'piṇḍa'.[31] In para. 674 we are told that Bhāruci explained the word 'niṣkāraṇa' in a sūtra of Viṣṇu and that he held that a daughter's son has not to perform the śrāddhas of his maternal grandfather if the latter has a son. Sudarśanācārya in his comment on Āpastamba Gṛhya. 8.21. 2 ascribes the same view to Bhāruci.[32] In para. 681 the Sarasvatīvilāsa honours Bhāruci by calling him 'bhagavat' and gives his explanation of a sūtra of Viṣṇu that whoever is authorised to perform the śrāddhas of a person and receives the estate of that person is alone to perform the śrāddhas for that person. In para. 711 Bhāruci's explanation of Viṣṇu's sūtra (saṁsṛṣṭadhanaṁna patnyabhigāmi) is given. In para. 719 Bhāruci's remarks on Viṣṇu's sūtra (pitṛvyāpitṛbhrātṛbhir eva saṁsargo nānyaiḥ) are cited. In para. 724 Bhāruci in commenting upon a sūtra of Viṣṇu (saṁsṛṣṭi-

---

[31] Para 637: यथाह भारुचिरेतद्विष्णुवचनव्याख्यानावसरे बीजशब्दः पिण्डवाचीति. The sūtra of विष्णु is बीजग्रहणानुविधायमंशं गृह्णीयात् (para 636).

[32] Para 674: अत्र भारुचिः। निष्कारणमिति वदता विष्णुना समनन्तरकर्तृणां पुत्रादीनां विद्यमानत्वे दौहित्रस्य न कर्तृत्वसंक्रान्तिरिति। The sūtra of विष्णु is दौहित्रस्य मातामहश्राद्धं निष्कारणम्. The words of सुदर्शन are इममेवार्थं भारुचिरप्याह यस्मिन्पक्षे अपुत्रो मातामहः पुत्रिकासुतश्चाखिलद्रव्यहारी तस्मिन्पक्षे तस्य पिण्डदाननियमः इत्यादिना ग्रन्थेन।

nām piṇḍakṛt aṁśahārī) is said to have remarked that the capacity to offer piṇḍas is the guiding principle in taking the inheritance. In para. 736 Bhāruci is said to have explained the word 'bhinnodarāṇām' in a sūtra of Viṣṇu (bhinnodarāṇām saṁsṛṣṭino gṛhṇīyuḥ).[33] Para. 848 gives Bhāruci's explanation of a long sūtra of Viṣṇu about property not liable to partition.[34] There is nothing unnatural in Bhāruci having written a commentary on Viṣṇu. The extant Viṣṇudharmasūtra contains doctrines peculiar to the Viśiṣṭādvaita system, such as the worship of Nārāyaṇa or Vāsudeva, the four vyūhas of Vāsudeva, etc. If Bhāruci was a Viśiṣṭādvaitin he would naturally turn to the Viṣṇudharmasūtra as having the greatest claim on his attention. One remarkable thing is that none of the eight sūtras of Viṣṇu cited above occurs in the printed Viṣṇudharmasūtra. This leads to the presumption that the printed work is either a mutilated or abridged version of the original Dharmasūtra.

There are numerous points on which there is divergence between Bhāruci and V. A few of the more interesting ones are set out below from the Sarasvatīvilāsa.

(1) Bhāruci defined 'dāya' as 'that paternal wealth that is liable to partition' and he spoke of Dravyavibhāga and Dharmavibhāga also. Bhāruci did not approve of the definition of dāya given by Asahāya and adopted by the M. as 'svāmisambandha' is a source of ownership and cannot be the 'lakṣaṇa of ownership (*vide*-para. 8, 19-20).

(2) Bhāruci defined 'vibhāga' as separation in connection with one out of the two, *viz.*, dravya and dharma (religious rites). while the definition of M. would exclude mere dharmavibhāga (para. 22-25).

(3) V. explains Yāj. II. 117 (mātur duhitaraḥ, etc.) as laying down that the mother's strīdhana is first taken by the daughters and in the absence of daughters by the sons of the woman, while Bhāruci explains that in the absence of sons, a woman's strīdhana is

---

[33] अत्र भारुचिः । भिन्नोदराणामिति निर्धारणे षष्ठी । भिन्नोदराणां मध्ये संसृष्टिन एव धनं गृह्णयुः ।

[34] The sūtra is अपिध्यं गार्भं धार्मं मैत्रं वैधमाकस्मिकमादशाब्दं प्रविभाज्यमत ऊर्ध्वं सर्वमाविभाज्यम ।

taken by her daughters and in the absence of daughters by the woman's paternal uncle and others. It is to be noted that the M. follows Viśvarūpa, who refers to the view of some that is the same as Bhāruci's.[35]

(4) V. explained the text of Gautama (28.22) as conferring the strīdhana of a woman first on her unmarried daughters, then on married daughters, among whom indigent ones were to be preferred to those who were well off. Bhāruci distributed the strīdhana among unmarried daughters and married but indigent daughters equally.[36]

(5) Bhāruci allowed Niyoga in the case of a childless widow, while the M. condemned Niyoga in the case of every widow and held that the texts on this matter (such as Manu. IX. 59) applied only to a girl betrothed[37]. Thus Bhāruci is nearer to those Smṛtis that allowed *Niyoga* to widows than Viśvarūpa who restricts it to Śūdra and Kṣatriya widows.

(6) Bhāruci explains Manu. IX. 163 (eka evaurasaḥ putraḥ pitryasya vasunaḥ prabhuḥ) as applying to a case where a man having an only son adopts another and as providing for the maintenance of only the Dattaka and not of others, while M. (on Yāj. II. 132) says that the verse of Manu applies only where the Dattaka and other kinds of sons are inimical to the *aurasa* and where they are devoid of good qualities.[38]

(7) According to M. the word *riktha* should mean 'apratibandhadāya' and *saṁvibhāga* should mean 'sapratibandhadāya,' although in such passages as Yāj. II. 51 ('rikthagrāha ṛiṇam dāpyaḥ') the word 'riktha' seems to have been used in the sense of 'sapratibandhadāya'. Bhāruci did not make this distinction. It will be noticed that Viśvarūpa also is silent about 'sapratibandha' and 'apratibandha' *dāya*.[39]

---

[35] एतच्च मातुर्दुहितरःशेषमितिवचनमन्यथा व्याकुर्वन्ति भारुचिप्रभृतयः । पुत्राभावे मातुर्धनं दुहितरो विभजेरन् तदभावे स्वान्वयः पितृव्यादिर्गृह्णीयात् । (para 142); अन्ये तु ताभ्यो दुहितृभ्य ऋते तदीय एवान्वय इति वर्णयन्ति तत्त्वयुक्तम् । विश्वरूप.

[36] Para. 302.

[37] Para 350-51: पुत्रवत्याः शय्यापालनं दुहितृमत्या वा तदभावे नियोगादप्यपत्योत्पादनमावश्यकम् ।...... शय्यापालनात्संताननिर्वाह एव श्रेयानिति भारुच्यपरार्कसोमेश्वरादीनां मतम् ।

[38] Para. 383.

[39] Para. 464-65.

(8) According to Bhāruci, a fellow student (sabrahmacārin) was like a brother and hence if a man dies leaving no fellow student even, then the sons of the fellow student, the widows of the fellow student and the widows of the sons of the fellow student succeeded one after another and in the absence of even all these, a śrotriya Brāhmaṇa took the wealth of the deceased. According to M. in the absence of the fellow student, a śrotriya succeeded at once.[40] This shows that Bhāruci was in one respect at least more liberal to women than the M.

(9) On account of the verse of Yāj. II. 126 ('anyonyāpahṛtam', etc.) Bhāruci thought that if coparceners conceal some joint property there was no offence (of theft), while M. held that there was theft in such a case. It is to be noted that the same view is attributed to Viśvarūpa by the Dāyabhāga, though not traced in the printed text. The M. controverts this view without naming any particular writer.

In many other places the Sarasvatīvilāsa refers to the views of Bhāruci (*e.g.*, in paragraphs 13, 69, 270, 316, 501, 752, 764).

SRIKARA.

The M. on Yāj. II. 135 alludes to the view of Śrīkara and others that the widow succeeded as heir to her deceased husband's estate if it was small.[41] M. gives Śrīkarācārya's explanation of Yāj. II. 169 and disapproves of it. It is to be noted that Viśvarūpa also gives two explanations of this verse.

The works of Jīmūtavāhana, the Smṛticandrikā, the Sarasvatīvilāsa and the Vīramitrodaya contain several notices of Śrīkara's views.

(1) Śrīkara, according to the Sarasvatīvilāsa (para. 555) held that 'duhitaraḥ' in Yāj. II. 135 means 'putrikā' and that this view of his agrees with that of Dhāreśvara, Devasvāmin, and Devarāta. It has been seen that Viśvarūpa held the same view.

(2) According to the Smṛticandrikā (II, p. 297), the Sarasvatīvilāsa (para. 573) and the Vīramitrodaya (p. 664) Śrīkara gave

---

40 Para. 607.

41 एतेनाल्पधनविषयत्वं श्रीकरादिभिरुक्तं निरस्तं वेदितव्यम् ।

the wealth of a deceased person to his father and mother equally at the same time.

(3) According to the Dāyabhāga (p. 296) Śrīkara preferred the full brother to the half brother on the ground of the superior spiritual benefit conferred by the full brother. Viśvarūpa also did the same as seen above, but it is not clear from his comment whether he did it on the theory of spiritual benefits.

(4) The Dāyabhāga (p. 299) very severely criticizes the arguments and explanations of Śrīkara on the verse of Yāj. ('saṁsṛṣṭinas tu.' etc.). Śrīkara explained that the general rule was that a re-united coparcener took the estate left by a deceased re-united member and that the words 'sodarasya tu sodaraḥ' were an exception to that rule (laying down that an un-reunited full brother was preferred to a re-united half-brother). M. gives a different explanation.

(5) The Dāyabhāga (p. 314) says that Śrīkara understood the words of Yāj. 'anyodaryas tu' as elucidating the words 'saṁsṛṣṭinas tu. etc.' It is somewhat remarkable that Viśvarūpa observe that some read the verse 'anyodaryasya saṁsṛṣṭī' as an elucidation of the previous verse and explains it in the same way as Śrīkara is said to have done. Viśvarūpa therefore was inclined not to regard the verse as properly authenticated. Our knowledge of the several commentaries on Yāj. is so meagre that one is loath to hazard a conjecture. But it looks as if Śrīkara preceded even Viśvarūpa. It is of course possible that Viśvarūpa may refer to some predecessor whose views were later adopted by Śrīkara. In many of the views above set forth Śrīkara either agrees with Viśvarūpa or holds views more antiquated than those of Viśvarūpa.

(6) According to the Dāyabhāga Śrīkara explained a verse of Kātyāyana to mean that among re-united coparceners if one acquired some property by employing common funds then the acquirer got two shares and the rest one share each.[42]

(7) The Dāyabhāga states that whatever is acquired as a reward for any *vidyā* becomes the self-acquired property of the

[42] किं च कात्यायनवचनं विभक्ताः पितृवित्ताच्चेदकत्र प्रतिवासिनः। विभजेयुः पुनर्द्व्यंशं स लभेतोदयी यतः। इदं संसृष्टस्य साधारणधनोपघातेनार्जकस्य भागद्वयमितरेषामेकैको भाग इति श्रीकरेण व्याख्यातम्। दायभाग (p. 174).

acquirer and that Kātyāyana entered into detailed illustrations of gains of learning for dispelling the errors of Śrīkara and others. The Dāyabhāga does not mean that Kātyāyana wrote after Śrīkara. The meaning is that Kātyāyana wanted to dispel such errors as Śrīkara and others committed later on.[43] The Dāyabhāga quotes Śrīkara's explanation of Kātyāyana above. Śrīkara seems to have thought that all property acquired in a state of union by any member was liable to partition and that 'acquisition without detriment to paternal estate' was not a proper criterion for judging self-acquisition.

(8) Śrīkara looked upon wealth obtained by gift as 'vidyādhana' and thus brought about a confusion between (wealth obtained by) officiating at a sacrifice, teaching and gift. This is very stupid, according to the Dāyabhāga (p. 197).

(9) The Vyavahāramātṛkā (p. 292) says that in a suit for money (such as 'you owe me a hundred') hundred is said by Śrīkara to be the *dharmi* and 'being liable to pay another' the *sādhya* (in the language of the Nyāya system) and finds fault with Śrīkara (in the true schoolman style) by saying that the *dharmi* (gold and corn, etc.) is liable to destruction by use and so there will result the fault of āśrayāsiddha.

(10) The Vyavahāramātṛkā (p. 302) thinks that Yogaloka took an example of *kāraṇottara* from Śrīkara.

(11) Śrīkara refers to the verse of Nārada (ṛṇādāna 237) and says that if the witnesses of a party depose to more or less than what the party asserts, then they are no witnesses and the party is defeated (Vyavahāramātṛkā, p. 334). A similar view was held by Viśvarūpa.

(12) The Vyavahāramātṛkā (p. 342) gives the explanation of Śrīkaramiśra on Yāj. II. 24 which comes to this that enjoyment of land for twenty years by one even without title before the very eyes of the owner and without protest from the latter results in the loss of the ownership of the original owner and constitutes a title in itself and that such verses as 'whoever enjoys even for many hundred years without title should be punished as a thief' (Nārada)

---

43 तदयमर्थो यया कयाचिद् विद्यया यल्लब्धमर्जकस्यैव तन्नेतरेषां प्रदर्शनार्थं तु कात्यायनेन विस्तरेणोक्तं श्रीकरादिभ्रमनिरासार्थम्। दायभाग (p. 196).

refer to cases where the owner is absent.[44] M. appears to refer to this view in its comment on Yāj. II. 24.

(13) The Smṛticandrikā (II, p. 266) mentions that Śrīkara said that nobody offers a big bull to a learned guest as there is no such *śiṣṭācāra* now, while Viśvarūpa said that offering of a bull is negatived by *śiṣṭācāra*, which way of stating the matter is improper.

Whether Śrīkara wrote a commentary on some Smṛti or a digest (nibandha) it is difficult to say. From the numerous explanations of Yājñavalkya's text cited above it appears that he commented on the Yājñavalkya-smṛti. But the Smṛticandrikā[45] (II, p. 266) says that Śambhu, Śrīkara and Devasvāmin compiled together several Smṛtis into digests (and are hence styled Smṛtisamuccayakāra). The Smṛtisāra of Harinātha refers to a Śrīkaranibandha (India Office Catalogue, p. 448, No. 1489). The Smṛtyarthasāra of Śrīdhara (Ānandāśrama edition) says that Smṛtis being scattered, Śrīkaṇṭha and Śrīkarācārya made them into one consistent whole (lit. they filled the gaps in the Smṛtis). Therefore it looks as if even though Śrīkara wrote a commentary it was of the nature of a comprehensive digest.

As Śrīkara is cited by M. he is certainly earlier than 1050 A.D. As his views agree in the main with those of Viśvarūpa he is not much later than the latter and if Viśvarūpa be held to be referring to Śrīkara in his remarks on Yāj. (*vide* No. 5 above), then Śrīkara would be earlier than even the first half of the 9th century. At all events he must be placed somewhere between 750 and 1050 A.D.

MEDHATITHI.

M. (on Yāj. II. 124) refers to the views of Asahāya and Medhātithi about the fourth share to be given to an unmarried sister and follows it in preference to Bhāruci's.

---

44 श्रीकरमिश्राणां समाधानं पश्यतः प्रतिवादिनो विवंदिमकुर्वतः भूमेर्विंशतिवर्षभोगः प्रमाणान्तरानिरपेक्षः प्रमाणं तावता च प्रतिवादिनस्तद्भूमिस्वत्वहानिः । ...आगमरहितायाश्च भुक्तेः प्रामाण्यबोधकवचनानि अनागमं तु यो भुङ्क्ते इत्यादीनि प्रतिवादिपरोक्षविषयाणि । व्यवहारमातृका.

45 ये पुनः स्मृतिसमुच्चयकाराः शम्भुश्रीकरदेवस्वाम्यादयः संप्रत्युद्धारविषमविभागयोः शिष्टाचारं मन्यमाना उद्धारादिविषयाणि स्मृतिवाक्यानि विचारयितुं ग्रन्थविस्तारं चक्रिरे ।

On Yāj. II. 24 M. refers to the fact that Dhāreśvara, Viśvarūpa and Medhātithi did not accept certain texts of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga.

Medhātithi wrote a *bhāṣya* on the Manusmṛti. It was first published about forty years ago by Rao Saheb V. N. Mandlik and recently by Mr. Gharpure and it is in course of translation by Mahāmahopādhyāya Dr. Ganganath Jha. Here Mr. Gharpure's edition has been used. The *bhāṣya* as printed is corrupt in many places, particularly in the 8th, 9th and 12th adhyāyas. In Mr. Gharpure's edition there is no comment on verses 182-202 of the 9th chapter. In several MSS. of the bhāṣya at the end of several chapters there is a verse which says that a king named Madana, son of Sahāraṇa, brought from other countries copies of Medhātithi's commentary and brought about a restoration (*jīrṇoddhāra*).[46] This refers, as Bühler says, not to the restoration of the text of the commentary, but to that of the library of the King, who was Madanapāla, of Kāṣṭhā, son of Sādhāraṇa, and flourished in the latter half of the fourteenth century.

Bühler in his learned and exhaustive introduction to the Manusmṛti (*S.B.E.* Vol. 25) brings together a good deal of information about Medhātithi (pp. cxviii—cxxvi). No useful pupose will be served by repeating what he has already stated. In the following lines a concise statement of the results of his study will be given and some details will be added which were not noticed by that learned scholar.

Bühler is not quite accurate when he states (p. cxx, footnote 1) "though the opinions of 'others' are mentioned very frequently and though sometimes those of three or four predecessors are contrasted, Medhātithi gives only once the name of an early commentator." Medhātithi does mention by name several predecessors. On Manu. VIII. 3 Medhātithi refers to other interpretations offered by Bhartṛyajña and asks his readers to refer to the work of that author[47]. On VIII. 151 he quotes the differing ex-

[46] मान्या कापि मनुस्मृतिस्तदुचिता व्याख्या हि मेधातिथेः सा लुप्तैव विधेर्वशात् क्वचिदपि प्राप्यं न यत्पुस्तकम्। क्षोणीन्द्रो मदनः सहारणसुतो देशान्तरादाहृतैर्जीर्णोद्धारमचीकरत्तत इतस्तत्पुस्तकैर्लेखितैः ॥

[47] व्याख्यानान्तराणि भर्तृयज्ञेनैव सम्यक्कृतानीति तत एवावगन्तव्यानि सर्वथा प्रमाणमूलानि etc.

planation of Yajvan and on VIII. 156 he again mentions Yajvan by name. Yajvan is probably only the latter half of some name (like Devarājayajvan). On VIII. 156 he mentions by name Asahāya. In his somewhat lengthy comment on VIII. 152 Medhātithi twice quotes the explanations of a writer by name Ṛju.[48] Bühler is unable to make out anything of the corrupt word preceding Viṣṇusvāmin in Medhātithi's comment on Manu. IX. 253. Some MSS. read it as 'Kāvara,' others as 'Kovara'. If a conjecture may be hazarded that word is probably Kāvera (*i.e.*, residing on the Kāverī river). From the quotation[49] it appears that Viṣṇusvāmin is not a commentator on Manu but rather a writer on the Pūrvamīmāṁsā. Medhātithi quotes an Upādhyāya (on IX ·141 and 147 as Bühler points out and also on II. 109, IV. 162 and V. 43) and Bühler holds that Medhātithi means his own teacher. It seems more likely that Upādhyāya is the name (or rather part of a name) of some previous commentator and does not mean his teacher.

Bühler rightly holds (against the views of Dr. Jolly) that Medhātithi was a man from the North, probably from Kashmir, as he introduces the country of Kashmir in explaining 'svarāṣṭre,' 'janapadaḥ' (in Manu. VII. 32 and VIII. 41), in giving the monopoly of the sale of saffron as a privilege of the king of Kashmir in repeatedly referring to the Kāṭhaka Śākhā and in saying that the rainbow is called 'vijñāna-cchāyā' in Kashmir (on Manu. IV. 59). He very often refers to the northerners, *e.g.*, he says, on Manu. III. 234, that 'kutapa' is the name of what is well known as 'kambala' among the northern peoplē and on III. 238 he says 'northern people wrap their head with *śāṭakas*' (garments). He also says on Manu. II. 24 that in the Himalayas in Kashmir it is not possible to perform the daily *sandhyā* in the open nor a bath in the river in 'hemanta' and 'śiśira.' On III. 18 he says 'In other countries, some say, people marry one's maternal uncle's daughter and hence the words of Manu in III. 18.' but Medhātithi declares it to be opposed to Gautama (4. 3 and 5) and proceeds 'even in that country taking food

48 एतत्तु ऋतुना पुरुषान्तरमसंक्रान्तामिति व्याख्यातम्। ..... ऋजुस्तु तस्मादेवाधर्मेणाऽनवीकृते प्रयोगे द्विगुणाधिकां वृद्धिं नेच्छति।

49 अतो यावती काचित्फलश्रुतिः सा सर्वार्थवाद इति कोवरविष्णुस्वामी।

in the same plate with (or in company of) one whose thread ceremony is not performed is not at all regarded as *dharma*.'[50] This is clearly a reference to the Sūtra of Baudhāyana (I.1. 19) according to whom taking food in the same plate with those whose *upanayana* is not performed and marrying 'mātulasutā' are two of the five usages peculiar to the South. It is to be noted, however, that later writers like Kamalākara (in his Nirṇayasindhu, 3rd Paricocheda on Sāpiṇḍya) regard Medhātithi as a southerner.

He refers to his own work called Smṛtiviveka (on II. 6 and X. 5), which seems to have been a work in verse or contained numerous verses. In the Parāśaramādhavīya (vol. I, part 2, pp. 183-186) there is a long quotation in verse from a work called Smṛtiviveka and there are several verses attributed to Medhātithi in tha work (*vide* vol. I, part 1, p. 276 and part 2, p. 172). A certain writer called Lollaṭa (on śrāddha) frequently quotes verses of Medhātithi.

He seems to have been a profound student of the Pūrvamīmāṁsā. His comment is full of the terms *vidhi* and *arthavāda*. He quotes Jaimini's sūtras frequently and applies them to the interpretation of Smṛti texts at every step. To take only a few examples at random, on Manu. VIII. 100 he construes the sūtra of Jaimini (VI. 7. 3) forbidding the gift of land in the Viśvajit as referring to the whole of the earth. On Manu. II. 107 he refers to the sūtra of Jaimini (IV. 3. 5) and to the rātrisattra-nyāya (IV. 3. 17-19). On Manu. I. 84 he says that *saṁvatsara* means 'a day' in a long *sattra* (for which *vide* Jaimini VI. 7. 31-40). On II. 23 he refers to the vidhivannigadādhikaraṇa (I. 2. 19-20). On II. 29 he speaks of the sarvaśākhāpratyaya-nyāya (Jaimini II. 4. 8-32) and applies it to Smṛtis. On the same verse he refers to the grahaikatva-nyāya (Jaimini III. 1. 13-15).

He quotes on Manu. I. 19 a verse from Sāṅkhyakārikā (prakṛter mahān, etc.) He refers to Vindhyavāsa (on Manu. I. 55) as a Sāṅkhya, says that he does not admit a subtle interim body (antarābhavadeha) and explains the latter term.[51] This is probably

50 अस्मिन्नपि देशेऽनुपनीतेन सह भोजनादिराचारो नैव धर्मत्वेनेष्यते ।

51 सांख्या अपि केचिन्नान्तराभवमिच्छन्ति विन्ध्यवासप्रभृतयः ।

taken from Kumārila's words.[52] He repeatedly refers to the Purāṇas and on III. 232 tells us that they were composed by Vyāsa and contained accounts of creation, etc. He refers to Bṛhaspati as a writer on Vārtā (on Manu. VII. 43 and IX. 326) and on VIII. 285 refers to the works of Bṛhaspati and Uśanas on politics and government. Uśanas is also mentioned in the comment on Manu. VIII. 50. On Manu. VII. 43 he refers to Cāṇakya as a writer on Daṇḍanīti. In numerous places he seems to have drawn upon Kauṭilya's work. For example, on Manu. VII. 54 he mentions the testing of ministers by Upadhās. On Manu. VII. 155 in interpreting 'pancavarga' as 'kāpaṭika, udāsthita, gṛhapatika, vaidehika and tāpasavyañjana' he explains these terms almost in the words of Kauṭilya (I, chap. 2). *Vide* also the quotations on Manu. VII. 61, 81, 78 and 148.

Bühler at first took the remark (on Manu. XII. 19) about 'Śārīraka' as referring to Śaṅkara's *bhāsya* on the Vedāntasūtra, but later on changed his opinion (*S.B.E.* Vol. 25, p. cxxii) and held that it probably implies a reference to the Śārīraka sūtras. Bühler does not seem to be right. The words 'yatheha-rājā . . . apaiti' are a summary of Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya* on Vedāntasūtra II. 1. 34 and II. 3. 42. In another place (on Manu. II. 83) Medhātithi refers to the Upaniṣadbhāṣya on Chāndogya II. 23. 4 and tells us that the Upaniṣad passage has been differently explained in the *bhāṣya*. Śaṅkara does explain that passage differently. But this is not all. In various other places Medhātithi appears to be referring to the *bhāṣya* of Śaṅkara on the Vedāntasūtras. In his comment on Manu. I. 7 he gives several theories and places the Advaitadarśana as the last and refers to the vivartavāda and the well-known example of the sea and its waves. On I. 80 he appears to refer to Śaṅkara's *bhāṣya* on the sūtra 'lokavat tu līlākaivalyam' (Vedāntasūtra II. 1. 33).[53] He, however, seems to have favoured the position that the attainment of the highest *brahma* called *mokṣa* is due not to mere correct knowledge, but to the combination (samuccaya) of

---

[52] अन्तराभवदेहस्तु नेष्यते विन्ध्यवासिना ।

[53] लील्यापि कौतुकेनापि लोके राजादीनां प्रवृत्तिर्दृश्यते इति ब्रह्मविदः । मेधातिथि ; यथालोके कस्यचिदाप्तैषणस्य राज्ञो ... लीलारूपाः प्रवृत्तयो भवन्ति etc.—शाङ्करभाष्य.

knowledge and Karma[54] (*vide* his remarks on Manu. XII. 87, 90, and VI. 32, 74-75).

He gives at least three interpretations of the verse of Yāj, about twenty years' possession (II. 24), none of which agrees exactly with that of Viśvarūpa. His work is a mine of information on all sorts of topics, but considerations of space forbid any further pursuit of this matter.

As Medhātithi quotes Kumārila and also refers to Śaṅkara and as M. looks upon him as a writer of established reputation, Medhātithi is later than 825 A.D. and earlier than 1000 A.D. and probably flourished between 825 and 900 A.D. This conclusion is somewhat strengthened by the fact that though he names Asahāya, he does not refer to Viśvarūpa or Bhāruci or Śrīkara and therefore could not have flourished much later than Viśvarūpa. If by Miśra in his comment [55] on Manu. XII. 118 he refers to Vācaspatimiśra, author of the Bhāmati and other works, then his date will be somewhere after 850 A.D.

DHARESVARA.

M. says (on Yāj. II. 135) that Dhāreśvara tries to reconcile the conflicting texts about the right of the widow to succeed to the estate of her deceased husband by saying that she succeeds if her sonless husband was separate and if she is willing to submit to *Niyoga*. M. on the same verse says that Dhāreśvara relying on Manu 9.217 placed the paternal grandmother immediately after the mother and before the father. On Yāj. III. 24 M. says that certain texts of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga and others about impurity on death were not accepted as authoritative by Dhāreśvara, Viśvarūpa and Medhātithi. The Smṛticandrikā [56] (II, p. 294) quotes a verse from the Saṅgrahakāra which asserts the same views about the widow's rights as those of Dhāreśvara and says that the position of Dhāreśvara was controverted by Viśvarūpa. The Sarasvatī-

[54] अतश्च ब्रह्मनिष्ठारेणापि वेदाभ्यासादीन्यनुष्ठेयानि । यस्य यस्य कमन्यासः श्रूयते स पष्ठे व्याख्यातः—मेधातिथि on Manu. XII. 87; इदं तु ज्ञानकर्मणोः समुच्चयान्मोक्ष इति श्लोकद्वय ज्ञापकम्। मेधातिथि on Manu. VI. 74-75.

[55] प्रमाणान्तराणामपि एकत्वप्रतिपादनपरत्वादेव ग्राहिणः प्रत्यक्षस्य मिश्रैः कृत एव क्लेशः।

[56] तथा संग्रहकारः । भ्रातृषु प्रविभक्तेषु संसृष्टेष्वसत्सु च । गुर्वादेशान्नियोगस्था पत्नी धनसमाप्नुयात् ॥

vilāsa (para. 576 and 593) says, just as M. does, that Dhāreśvara preferred the paternal grandmother to the father. The **Hāralatā** (p. 117) makes the remark (similar to that of M. on Yāj. II. 24) that Bhojadeva, Viśvarūpa, Govindarāja and the Kāmadhenu did not cite certain texts as Jātūkarṇa's and that therefore the latter were not authoritative.

That Dhāreśvara is to be identified with Bhojadeva of Dhārā, perhaps the most famous Indian prince as a patron of learned men, follows from several considerations. The Dāyabhāga cites Bhojadeva and Dhāreśvara without making any distinction between the two. Some views that are ascribed in one work to Dhāreśvara are ascribed to Bhojadeva by another. The Vivādatāṇḍava of Kamalākara ascribes to Bhojadeva the same views as to the widow's rights that are ascribed to Dhāreśvara by M. Besides, works on numerous branches of knowledge were composed by (or in the name of) Bhoja, king of Dhārā. MSS. of the Rājamārtaṇḍa (commentary on the Yogasūtra) have colophons saying that the work was composed by Dhāreśvara Bhojarāja. The introductory fourth verse of that work says that Bhoja composed (beside that work) a work on grammar and on Vaidyaka. He wrote an astronomical work (called Rājamṛgāṅka) and two works on poetics, the Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa and the Sṛṅgāraprakāśa.

Dhāreśvara is styled Ācārya by the M. (on Yāj. III. 24) and Sūri by the Smṛticandrikā (II, p. 257).

Bhoja of Dhārā reigned according to the Bhojaprabandha for 55 years. There are two certain dates of his. One is his grant dated Saṁvat 1078 (1021-22 A.D.). *See Ind. Ant.* vol. 6, p. 53. His astronomical work takes Śaka 964 (1042-43 A.D.) as its initial date. His uncle Muñja was slain by Tailapa between 994-997 and Muñja was succeeded by Sindhurāja or Sindhula also styled Navasāhasāṅka. An inscription of Jayasiṁha the successor of Bhoja is dated Saṁvat 1112 (1055-56 A.D.). *See Ep. Ind.* vol. 3, pp. 46-50. Therefore Bhoja must have reigned between 1005 and 1055 A.D.

There are some points (besides those mentioned above about the widow's right of inheritance and about the grandmother succeeding before the father) on which M. differs from Dhāreśvara.

(1) The Vīramitrodya tells us (pp. 528 and 536 of Jivananda's ed.) that Dhāreśvara regarded ownership as known only from Śāstra. while M. holds it to be *laukika*. It is probably due to Dhāreśvara's position that M. enters into an elaborate discussion on this point.

(2) The Smṛticandrikā[57] (II, p. 295-96), the Sarasvatīvilāsa (para. 555) and the Vīramitrodaya (p. 658) say that Dhāreśvara held. like Viśvarūpa, that the word 'duhitaraḥ' in Yāj. stands for 'putrikā' in the order of succession; M. introduces no such distinction.

On some points Dhāreśvara and M. agree.

The Sarasvatīvilāsa (para. 392) tells us that Dhāreśvara and Devasvāmin[58] held the same view as that of V. on the verse of Manu (9.182 bhrātṝṇām ekajātānām), *viz.*, that the verse forbids the adoption by the other brothers of strangers when they have a nephew. M. expresses this view on Yāj. II. 132.

The Smṛticandrikā (II, p. 266) says that Dhāreśvara remarked about the verse of Manu (IX. 112 'jyeṣṭhasyȧ viṁśa uddhāraḥ') that he does not discuss such texts as people have come to absolutely ignore them. M. says the same thing on Yāj. II. 117.[59]

The Dāyabhāga (p. 284) says that Viśvarūpa, Jitendriya. Bhojadeva and Govindarāja held that the daughter's son succeeds after the daughter and this decision must be accepted.[60] The order in which the authors are arranged and their known chronological position leads one to presume that Viśvarūpa was probably the first jurist to expressly recognize the daughter's son as an heir after the daughter. M. holds the same view.

The Dāyabhāga says that Dhāreśvara explains Yāj. II. 121 ('bhūryā pitāmahopāttā') as meaning that when the father effects a partition at his will during his lifetime, he has no power to give a larger or smaller share to any one as he can do with regard to self-acquired property. M. construes it similarly.

---

57 एवं सोपपत्तिकीं पत्न्यभावे दुहितृगामितां ब्रुवता बृहस्पतिनैव यद्दुहितृगामि धनमिति विधायकं वचनजातं तत्पुत्रिकाविषयमेव न पुनरपुत्रिकादुहितृविषयमिति धारेश्वरदेवस्वामिदेवरातमतं स्मृतितन्त्राभिज्ञत्वाभिमानोन्मादकल्पितं निरस्तं वेदितव्यम्।

58 धारेश्वरदेवस्वामिनौ तु विज्ञानयोगिमतानुवर्तिनावेव।

59 अयं विषमो विभागः शास्त्रदृष्टस्तथापि लोकविद्विष्टत्वान्नानुष्ठेयः।

60 तस्माद्विश्वरूपजितेन्द्रियभोजदेवगोविन्दराजैर्दुहित्रभावे दौहित्रास्याधिकारो निरूपित आदरणीयः।

Some of the other views ascribed to Dhāreśvara may be noticed here.

The Vyavahāramātṛkā (p. 284) gives Bhojadeva's explanation of a verse of Nārada ('sottaro' nuttaraś caiva').

The Smṛticandrikā notes (II, p. 254) that Dhāreśvara understands 'dāya' to mean wealth that comes to a man through the father and the mother. The Smṛtisaṅgraha defines 'dāya' in the same way.

The Smṛticandrikā[61] says that Dhāreśvara discussed in detail the point that there is nothing that one can use just as one pleases (and that therefore ownership cannot be defined as the power to dispose of the subject of ownership at one's sweet will). The Smṛtisaṅgraha gives a verse of similar import.

The Smṛticandrikā (II, p. 301) observes that Dhāreśvara reads the verse of Manu (p. 187) as 'yo yo hy anantaraḥ piṇḍāt' and explained 'piṇḍāt' as meaning 'sapiṇḍāt.'

Kullūka on Manu. VIII.184 says that four verses of Manu (VIII. 181-184) were arranged by Medhātithi and Bhojadeva in one way and by Govindarāja in another.

The foregoing resumé of the several views ascribed to Dhāreśvara by comparatively early writers makes it clear that Dhāreśvara composed some work on the several branches of Dharma (such as vyavahāra, dāya, śrāddha, āśauca, etc.). Whether his work was a commentary like that of Viśvarūpa or M. or whether it was an independent work or whether he wrote two works (as on Poetics) it is difficult to say. In one place the Smṛticandrikā (II, p. 302) says that Smṛtisaṅgraha follows Dhāreśvara's views Probably nothing more is meant than this that they held identical views. It appears that Bhoja's work on Dharmaśāstra was called Rājamārtaṇḍa. In the Śuddhi-Kaumudī (B.I. edition) of Govindānanda (wherein intercalary months from Śaka 1400 to 1457 are examined thereby showing the period when the author lived) a verse is cited as occurring in the Rājamārtaṇḍa of Bhojarāja about Śrāddha.[62]

---

61 यथेष्टविनियोज्यं किमपि नास्ति। प्रपञ्चितं चैतद्धारेश्वरसूरिणा।

62 अत एव राजमार्तण्डे भोजराजः। श्राद्धविघ्ने समुत्पन्ने मृतस्याविदिते दिने। अमावास्यां प्रकुर्वीत वदन्त्येके मनीषिणः॥

SYNTHETICISM IN INDIAN ICONOGRAPHY.

By Jamshedji M. Unvala, Ph.D.

(*Read on 6th August* 1925.)

The interesting subject of Indian iconography is very wide in its scope. It borders upon two important branches of study, the study of sculptural art and the study of religion. It is to be divided from the standpoint of religion into Buddhist, Jaina and Brahminic iconographies. The earliest works of the Indian sculptural art date as far back as the early centuries of Buddhism. The Gandhara or the Graeco-Buddhist period—about the first two centuries of the Christian era, when the hellenized Indo-Scythians settled on the north-western frontier of India—has produced some wonderful pieces of sculptures. These Indo-Scythians, who were also called Kushaṇas by their tribal name, were Buddhists. Kanishka, the founder of their dynasty, is reckoned as one of the champions of Buddhism. I shall pass over Buddhist iconography in this paper with the following two remarks, that it bears a pronounced Hellenic influence and that from the very nature of Buddhism it does not show those synthetic traits, which are peculiar to Brahminic iconography. It must be said that I use the word "Brahminic" not in a restricted sense, thereby meaning "pertaining to the votaries of Brahman," but in a very broad sense, especially thereby distinguishing it from Buddhist and Jaina iconographies. Further, I shall try to treat, or speaking more correctly, only to point out in this paper, a peculiar feature of Brahminic iconography, *viz.*, its synthetic feature, which is to my knowledge omitted in books pertaining to this subject. Prof. Macdonell has dealt with this subject chiefly from the historical standpoint in a paper entitled "The Development of early Hindu Iconography" in *JRAS.* 1916, pp. 125-30.

Very often Europeans use the words bizarre, curious, peculiar, etc., while criticizing Indian art, especially Indian idols. This is the opinion not only of laymen, but also of those initiated in the study of art. These Europeans are perfectly right in their criti-

cism, but it seems that they have hardly investigated the causes of this bizarre character, this curiousness and this peculiarity of Indian iconographical art.

Just as in ancient Egypt, in Assyria and Babylonia, in ancient Persia, in ancient Greece and Rome, and in the Christian world, especially the mediaeval one, so also in ancient India arts and most of the sciences are the outcome of religious beliefs. As it came to be believed that only those offerings and sacrifices that are performed at a certain fixed time are accepted by gods, the movements of the Sun and the Moon, and of other heavenly bodies were minutely studied and noted down by priests in order to avoid the untimely performance of sacrifices, which would be rather injurious in their effects than help-giving. These studies gave rise to astronomy and consequently to astrology. Not only should the time of sacrifices be precise, but also the place where they are performed, the altar should be exactly measured out, and the edifices which encircle this altar, the temple, should be mathematically constructed. Thus arose the science of geometry and mathematics. Similarly music tried to imitate the harmony of the spheres, and as it formed an essential part of the Jewish and, later on, of the Christian service, it was developed very early. The same is the case with drama, which has originated from the representations of the heroic feats and romances of the deified national heroes on the stage, as in case of the Greek and ancient Indian dramas, or from the miracle and passion plays of the middle ages, as in the case of modern European dramas. Even at present the modern Indian drama draws its material from heroic narratives. Similarly, when anthropomorphous traits were attributed to gods, chiefly through the primitive conception of religion, we have the introduction of the idols or images of gods, and as mostly all primitive society is based on the patriarchal system, the same system is attributed to the whole of the pantheon. We have not only gods and goddesses, but their celestial families and descendants. Among many and various attributes attached to gods are the manly vigour and prowess, and the perfect symmetry and beauty of the bodily form. Consequently, the heroes of the ancient Indians are considered to be the incarnations of gods and their consorts the incarnations of goddesses during their

life-time, and never cease to be considered as gods and goddesses even after their death, whereas all the national heroes of the ancient Greeks are deified only after their death. It is interesting to note that Antiochus II of Syria entitled himself Theos or god. This title was first borrowed by the Parthian king Mithridates II and his example was imitated by some of his successors. Thermusa, the queen of Phraates IV of Parthia, adopts the title Thea Ourania, *i.e.*, "the celestial goddess". This presumptuous title was modified later on, and the Perside satraps and their successors the Sasanian kings called themselves "sons of God" or "of divine descent". These titles were still more modified and we find them at present represented by the expression *dei gratia* or "by divine grace" on the coins of some of the monarchs of Europe. This *dei gratia* reminds us of the expression "by the will of Auramazdā" of the inscriptions of Darius the Great. The anthropomorphous traits are not suppressed even in monotheistic religions like Zoroastrianism, Judaism and Christianity, but they are elevated in conformity with the spirit of these religions. Instead of depicting their god and his retinue in palpable idols, they place them in the elevated sphere of imagination. The products of the poetic imagination of the authors of the Gāthās and the later Avesta must be viewed in this light, especially the beautiful descriptions of Mithra, Tishtrya, Anāhita and others in the Yasht literature. The mind of man is prone to analogies. It tries to depict in word, idol or picture the supernatural not only in worldly colours, but in colours familiar to it. Thus, for example, in a very rich edition of the Ethiopian version of the Bible published under the auspices of the Trustees of the British Museum there are very beautiful miniatures illustrating the lives of the Virgin Mary, Christ and other holy personages of the New Testament. What is most remarkable about these miniatures is that all these personages have the black colour of the skin and the features of the Ethiopic type. Similar is the case with the Armenian Bible. What a treasure of anthropology and ethnology lies buried, and mostly as yet unexcavated and unstudied, in the beautiful descriptions of the sacred scriptures of the Hindus, particularly in the equally sacred epics, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata, in the architectural and sculptural monuments and in the numismatic

relics so abundant in India ! It is interesting to note that the history, manners and customs, and religion of the Parthians, who could, in the opinion of the well-known historians like Mommsen and Rawlinson, claim by right of arms an equal share in the dominions of the then world known to the Romans and whom they feared as mighty foes, as they did the Teutons and the Britons, can be scientifically investigated from their numismatic relics.

The ancient classical peoples, the Greeks and the Romans, did not content themselves with depicting their gods and goddesses and heroes in poetic words, but set up their palpable idols in temples and had copies of these idols even in their houses. The Greek and the Roman pantheon, or better let us say the classical pantheon, is not as rich in the list of gods as the Hindu pantheon. I use the expression classical pantheon, because the Greek and Roman gods and goddesses do not differ from one another; they are the same gods and goddesses, only their names differ according to the respective languages, viz., Zeus and Jupiter, Selene and Luna, Artemis and Diana, Nike and Fortuna, and others. Again, only some of the representatives of the classical pantheon are represented in idols, mostly in one and the same stereotyped form. If there are two different idols of the same god or goddess, the difference exists only in the technique of the particular sculptor or the particular city, the main features, the main traits of the idol remain unchanged. Mostly the postures make this difference. But more than one posture of the same god or goddess is never translated into one idol, lest the artistic beauty, which lies in the perfection of form, may be marred. Thus we find that sculptors of ancient Greece and Rome had for the statues of gods and goddesses as models those Greeks and Romans, who were considered to be the perfection of masculine and feminine beauty. The Greek and Roman sculptors translated into stone only one aspect of a particular deity at a time. The perfect and deep veneration, which they entertained for a deity, is to be deduced from the extreme care and artistic labour, which they bestowed upon the working out of the statue of the deity. The statue must represent the perfection of the human bodily form and the perfection of beauty, for perfection is one of the attributes of the deity. It is no wonder, therefore, if Praxiteles,

the famous sculptor of ancient Greece, considered the goddess Aphrodite, the Greek Venus, as a woman deified for her beauty. His Dionysos represents, on the other hand, the perfect masculine beauty.

"The drawback of the Hindu sculptural art was not mainly due to the incompetence of the Hindus in this art. An accusation of incompetency against them is definitely refuted by the wonderful edifices with which the Hindu architects and sculptors have covered India under the bidding of the priest or the king, which are remarkable more for the gigantic labour and the minute and endless elaboration which they display, than for any lofty intellectual conception or any design of a creative mind. And among the thousands of graceful, pleasing and natural figures and faces of men and women which simple observation of nature taught the artisan to copy in stone in every temple and porch we shall seek in vain for that high order of intellectual conception which marks the marbles of Greece and Rome. A Phidias and a Michael Angelo were impossible in India". Thus Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt has expressed his opinion on Hindu architectural and sculptural art in his *History of Civilisation in Ancient India*, vol. II, p. 238. It must here be noted that the Hindu sculptors wrote down as it were the impressions left on their memory on stone and wood, and the use of models was unlike the Greeks quite unknown to them. Even to the present day the Hindu sculptors, especially those belonging to the traditional school, do not make use of models. I have seen in Bombay these unknown Indian artists chiselling from memory idols of Sarasvatī, Ganeśa and other Hindu deities, which are exquisite works of art. Still it must not be forgotten that as these sculptors generally belong to the artisan class (or caste), there is always a uniformity of design in their works, particularly a uniformity of lines and curves, which have come down to them traditionally from the father to the son. One cannot but say that the idols are always stereotyped. Only a short visit to the Indian rooms of the Musée Guimet of Paris, to the British Museum, and to the ethnological museums of Berlin, Copenhagen and Munich will suffice to convince one on this point. Again this stereotyping has been greatly aided by the conservative

spirit of the Hindus. Any deviation from the traditional is of course not tolerated.

As was said above, the drawback of the Hindu sculptural art was not mainly due to the incompetency of the Hindus in this art. But this art was handicapped by the attempt of the Hindu sculptors to represent all the different aspects and activities that are mythologically attributed to a deity in one stone figure only. Thus we have in the Hindu sculptures and in frescos and façades of temples and other places mythological stories completely depicted in stone. Here, therefore, every idea of proportion, harmony and of aesthetics in art is naturally out of the question.

Now I shall try to draw a line of demarcation in the specimens of known and published Hindu sculptures. Broadly speaking, they may be separated into three groups, the first group comprising sculptures representing abnormalities and monstrosities, the second comprising those representing abnormalities only, and the third comprising a group or groups of sculptures depicting some events mythologically placed in the life of a deity. Strictly speaking the third group comprises sculptures, which can also be classed in the first and the second groups. Thus in the first group the idols of Viṣṇu in his incarnations of Narasiṁha, Varāha, Matsya and Kūrma are to be placed. Here Viṣṇu is represented in a human body, but with the heads of a lion and a boar, and with the lower part of the body that of a fish and a tortoise respectively, and mostly with more than one pair of arms. The idols of the (three-eyed standing) Ganeśa (Exhibit no. 514 of Copenhagen) and of Hanumān, and of mythological beings like the Garuḍa (half eagle and half man), fall also in the same group. Further, a small idol of Viṣṇu in the plurality of his avatāras, which belonged once to the great chariot of Viṣṇu of Seringapatam, but is at present exhibited in the Musée Guimet, is very interesting. Viṣṇu is represented in it in a human body, with four heads, in the middle that of a lion, and on its right and left heads of boars, while the fourth head cannot be made out. He has four pairs of arms, but two feet only. Comparing these idols with those of the Triton, Typhon, Centaurs, Satyrs, Pans and Harpies of the Greeks, I find them monstrous in design and in some respect awe-inspiring, as in the case of the

six-handed man-lion tearing open the body of the demon Hiraṇya-Kaśipu. They are described in the catalogue of the Musée Guimet as those of Viṣṇu as half-man. half-lion, etc., but this description is of course not exact. Viṣṇu always remains in the imagination of the Hindu sculptor in his human form ; the incarnation of the god in the man-lion, boar, etc., is only expressed by the addition of the corresponding animal head. Except for the idea of the feats of this deity, which the idol inspires into us, there is nothing artistic in them, which can appeal to us. On the contrary, the above-mentioned Greek idols of the Centaurs, Satyrs and Pans are exquisite in their designs as a whole and also in parts. A Centaur is represented as half-man and half-horse, from head to waist man and except the neck and the head has the whole body of a horse. He fights with his hands like a man, and trots and runs like a horse. It seems that the horses and riders of Asia Minor, with whom the Greek settlers had to fight, were placed in the sphere of mythology as Centaurs by these Greeks, as they had no notion of horses and their use as riding animals. The Satyrs and Pans are forest-gods and gods of shepherds, and consequently they are represented from head to waist as men and from waist to feet as goats. The head is always adorned with goat's horns. The Typhon (on the Acropolis in Athens) is an opponent of Zeus. He has three busts of bearded men and from waist downwards a serpent's body with many coils. I repeat that all these Greek idols of mythological beings are, if we set aside the question of abnormalities, nicely worked out and do not appear to us as monstrous. A peculiar feature of this first group of Hindu idols is that the gods have always their human bodies and their heads only differ according to their particular incarnation or attribute, whereas in the Greek idols the upper half of the idol is always human and the lower half represents some animal. In connection with the ten incarnations of Viṣṇu it must be remarked that in the Yasht literature of the Zoroastrians the Yazat Bahrām, the deity presiding over victory, appears in ten different forms, as wind, bull, horse, male camel, boar, youth of fifteen years, eagle, ram, he-goat and warrior. Similarly Tishtrya, the deity presiding over rain, fights with the demon of drought in the shape of a horse. We have here again exact descriptions of the forms, in which these

deities help men, but they are always restricted to the sphere of poetic imagination and never translated into idols.

All those idols, which show abnormalities, fall in the second group of Hindu idols. These abnormalities consist mainly in the plurality of limbs, especially that of arms and hands, and very rarely of heads. The idols of the six-headed Kārttikeya, Trimūrti, Agni, Brahman, Rāvaṇa and others have the plurality of heads, whereas nearly all Hindu idols have the plurality of arms and hands. The Trilocana avatāra of Mahādeva or Śiva is represented in an idol with three eyes, the third one being in the middle of the forehead. These idols show a great weakness of the Hindu sculptural art from the artistic standpoint. But as I have said above, this art was handicapped by the attempts of the Hindu sculptors to represent all the different aspects and activities, that are mythologically attributed to a deity in one stone figure only. We have three heads, in the idol of the Trimūrti representing Brahman, Viṣṇu and Śiva, and of course with three pairs of arms, but only one pair of feet. Agni in an idol of the Musée Guimet has two heads, showing his two aspects, domestic fire and sacrificial fire; he has four hands, in two of which he holds fans for strengthening the fire. But in a modern painting of the Mathura school he is represented as a corpulent man, red in colour with two faces and eyes, eye-brows and hair of a reddish tawny hue. He has three legs and seven arms. He rides a ram and has that animal emblazoned on his banner. From his mouth forked tongues or flames issue, by means of which he licks up butter used in sacrifices. These characteristics have each and all special significance. (*The Gods of India* by Rev. E. O. Martin, London, 1914). Brahman has five heads in one idol, before the fifth was cut off by Śiva, whereas in another he has three heads. Rāvaṇa has in a painting ten heads and ten pairs of arms and hands. Lakṣmī has five heads and five pairs of arms. Even the Nāga, called Śeṣa, Ādi or Ananta, on whose coils Viṣṇu has his ordinary seat, has five heads. Similarly the Nāga, who protects the infant Kṛṣṇa is many-headed. Again, the chariot of the god Sūrya is drawn by a five-headed horse. These abnormalities in the plurality of limbs never extend to feet, except in the case of Agni, who has three legs. These gods and goddesses have only one pair of legs and are represented

either in a standing or a sitting posture. Some movements of the legs are very seldom attributed to deities in idols. If there is any, the god is represented dancing. There is a marvellous piece of the Hindu sculptural art in the Musée Guimet, a bronze figure of Śiva dancing. He stands on his right foot in a dancing posture, whereas the left is raised in the air and kept nearly parallel to his outstretched left arm. His hair is flowing and quite ruffled, from which Gaṅgā is shown emerging. The four-headed Dūrgā and Śiva-Bhairava (Exhibits no. 511, 510 of Copenhagen) are also represented dancing. Another curious idol is of wood and belonged originally to the chariot of Viṣṇu. It represents the god in the incarnation of Vāmana standing on one foot placed on the earth, while the other is raised to the extremity of his head and touches heaven. It is not at all difficult to explain the preponderance of the plurality of arms of the Hindu idols. The sculptor gives a deity in every hand some object or weapon, which is peculiar to him, or which shows us the particular action performed by him with these objects. It is for the most part with hands that he performs the deeds mythologically attributed to him, but neither with the head nor with the feet; the hands are, therefore, multiplied in his idols and not the head or the feet. If the heads of an idol are more than one, they represent the different aspects of the deity, as is clear in the case of Agni. Even in the case of Trimūrti we have ultimately the same deity, represented in his three different aspects, those of the Creator, the Preserver and the Destroyer. It is most probably through Hindu influence that two pairs of arms are given to Avalokiteśvara, as we see in a Tibetan idol of the Musée Guimet. Further, eleven-headed idols of this deity in a standing posture are very frequent in Nepal, Tibet and Japan. Prof. Gruenwedel writes in his *Buddhist Art in India* about these idols as follows : " They occur also at an early date in the Kanheri Buddhist cave temples, as well as among the ruins of Nakon Thom in Kambodia. In this form he is represented with four or more arms,—with the upper right hand he holds up a rosary, and with the left a long-stemmed lotus-flower. The uppermost head is that of Amitābha, who is represented as his spiritual origin—the others are arranged above one another, in threes, as in the Hindu Trimūrti, and either the lowest head is single or the

tenth counting upwards." (Op. cit. translated by Agnes C. Gibson, London, 1901). The head of Janus Bifrons or the double-faced Janus, one of the Italic deities, alone gives us a parallel to the second group of Hindu idols treated above. His bust is double-faced, one face in front and one behind. He enjoyed a temple in Rome, whose doors were left open during war and closed in peaceful times. There is a very interesting figure of Mercury, the Greek Hermes, in a relief on a silver vase of Neuwied in Germany. He is the messenger of the gods and carries as insignia of his office a caduceus. He is also the god of trade and commerce. As such he has always a bag full of money. As the god protecting flocks, he is always accompanied in sculptures by a ram. He is represented in the relief in question as a youth carrying in his right hand a bag full of money and in the left a caduceus. A ram is standing on his right, and a cock is perching on a small pillar on his left. Thus we have here the representation of Mercury in his three aspects, those of a merchant, a shepherd and the messenger of the gods. An Indian sculptor would have translated the same motive in an idol of the god with three pairs of arms showing his three different aspects.

Those sculptures which show a group of idols of gods and goddesses, or which represent an event mythologically placed in the life of a particular deity, must be placed in the third group of Indian sculptures. We have generally an idol of a god with his consort sitting on his lap, as in the case of the man-lion and his consort, and of Śiva and Pārvatī. The famous ancient holy chariot of Karikal represents scenes in the lives of Kṛṣṇa and Viṣṇu, *e.g.*, the infant Kṛṣṇa protected by the serpent Ādiśeṣa, and Kṛṣṇa the herdsman guarding his herds like Apollo and playing his flute. A highly artistic and exquisitely worked out specimen of the Hindu sculptural art is an ivory group of the modern Hindu school, exhibited in the Musée Guimet. It represents Durgā victorious over Mahiṣāsura. She has five pairs of arms, in each of which she is holding one of the following objects, a disk, a harpoon, a trident, a sabre, an arrow, a bow, a shield, a lance, a bell, and a poignard. She wears a crown of feathers. One of her feet is placed on the tiger, her riding animal, whereas the other rests on the ground. Two women are standing on her left and right hands. The tiger

attacks the Mahiṣāsura, who emerges in a human form from the body of a buffalo, whose head is cut off and lies on the ground. Ganeśa is sitting on his rat in the foreground on the right, whereas on the left Skanda is riding a peacock, The group as a whole is extremely fine, and all figures are proportional. We do not notice here that want of proportion, which characterizes the groups of Hindu sculptures. This want of proportion is not arbitrary, but clearly motived. The whole interest of the sculptor is centred in the chief central figure, in the deity, whom he wants to glorify in his work; the minor figures, whether human or animal, are only the means to his end. They are, therefore, always very small in size, mostly in the proportion of a giant to a dwarf, *e.g.*, in the idol of Vāmana, the gods in heaven are sculptured even smaller than the dwarfs in comparison to the deity. The idols of Bhavānī with the child, of Sūrya standing on a lotus and Kṛṣṇa riding on an elephant made of statuettes of nine Gopīs fall in the last group of Hindu sculptures. From the artistic standpoint, they are worthless as a whole, and they cannot be compared to the marvellous groups of Greek sculptures, which have their triumph in the Laokoon group of the Vatican in Rome. But in order to do justice to the Hindu sculptors the groups of the Hindu sculptures must be judged and criticised in parts. Then they can stand comparison not only with the classical, but also with modern sculptures. They are unsurpassable in some respects in their infinity of motives and designs. "In India the countless temples of gods are sculptured," says Mr. Romesh Chunder Dutt in Vol. II of his work quoted above, p. 239, "not only with the images of gods and goddesses, but with a representation of the whole universe, animate and inanimate; of men and women in their daily occupations, their wars, triumphs, and processions, of aerial and imaginary beings, Gandharvas and Apsarās, and the dancing girls; of horses, snakes, birds, elephants and lions; of trees and creepers of various kinds; of all that the sculptor could think of and his art could depict." An interesting parallel to the frescos and façades of Indian temples is to be found in the wooden carvings on the façades of the minster of Ulm in Wuertemberg, Germany, an architectural work of the fourteenth century. These carvings depict the whole life and doings of Christ

from his birth to his crucifixion, a copy of the Holy Bible, perhaps for those who could not read it. Again, we have the chief events of the New Testament in the wooden carvings and sculptures in the Notre Dame de Paris, an architectural work of the twelfth century, and in the Sainte Chapelle, a work of the thirteenth century near the Palais de la Justice of Paris. In the church of Ringsted in Danemark, built about the twelfth century, there are twenty-six important scenes, thirteen from the Old and thirteen from the New Testament, carved in wood over the monks' prayer-benches. Moreover, in the sculptures and carvings on the left portal of the Notre Dame de Paris scenes from the Christian heaven and hell are depicted. As in the middle ages learning was not universally spread among the people as at present in Europe, these sculptures helped undoubtedly to spread among them the teaching of the New Testament. Still more so is the case in India, where the peoples who are for the most part uneducated, are even at present kept in touch with their Purāṇas, and the great epics, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata, by means of the recital of the Kathās in temples and even in private houses. Thus these peculiar, abnormal and monstrous sculptures and groups of sculptures recall at sight to those educated in the mythology of their religion by means of the Kathās, which they have often heard. These sculptures have for them, so to say, life and speak to their very hearts.

Finally, in connection with the subject of syntheticism in Indian iconography it is interesting to note the entire absence of syntheticism in the idols depicted on the coins of the Indo-Scythian kings, Kanishka, Huvishka and Vāsudeva, who ruled in Kabul and the north of India somewhere about 78-150 A.D. This is due most probably to the Hellenic influence, under which they worked like nearly all other nations of Western Asia. Not only do we find on their coins the idols and names in Greek characters of the Zoroastrian deities, Mithra, Ātar, Vāta, Verethraghna, Māh, Farrah. Vanant and Aurvataspa, but also those of Skanda Kumāra, the Hindu god of war, and of Buddha Śākya, the founder of Buddhism.

To sum up my paper very briefly : while studying and criticizing the Hindu sculptural art, we should not lose sight of the fact that the Hindu sculptures generally represent the plurality either

of the aspects or of the activities of a deity, and sometimes even both in one and the same sculpture; and that in the groups of sculptures the sculptor wanted to draw our exclusive attention to one chief central figure, while the minor figures were only means to his end— the glorification of the central figure; and lastly that in order to understand the tales which these sculptors have to relate to us, we must have a good knowledge of the Hindu mythology.

August 1925.

PAÑCAMAHĀŚABDA IN THE RĀJATARANGIṆĪ

BY DR. S. KRISHNASVAMI AIYANGAR

UNIVERSITY OF MADRAS

(*Communicated by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar.*)

THE SANSKRIT TERM Pañcamahāśabda translates literally into "the five great sounds". Sanskrit dictionaries, however, do not seem to give the compound word, nor do they indicate that a separate compound like this exists with a distinct meaning of its own. Dictionaries of the Tamil and Kannaḍa languages give the term and the meaning, each in its own characteristic way. Both the Tamil Nighanṭus, Divākaram and Piṅgalandai, the older ones among those extant, give the five sounds as under, according to the manner in which, and the material by means of which, the sound is produced; these latter are (1) *tol* (leather), (2) *tuḻai* (hole or orifice), (3) *narambu* (strings, metalic or cat-gut), (4) *kañjanai* (bronze), and (5) *pāḍal* (vocal music). This is according to Divākaram, the oldest Tamil Nighanṭu. Piṅgalandai differs from this only in regard to item 4, which it gives in the form *kañjam*, and which is almost the same word as the other. These materials serve to make various musical sounds, and these last fall into five classes in consequence, according to their origin.

In Kannaḍa, however, the term Pañcavādya is a living expression, and has a ludicrous application in ordinary parlance, where one is said to ply the five instruments in urging a jaded pony to move on: digging with both heels, pulling the reins with the left hand, whipping it with the right, and urging it on by the use of the tongue. This gives unmistakable indication of the number five, and the different character of the sounds. Rev. Kittel's *Kannada Dictionary* takes the term Pañcamahāvādya, and gives, as its synonyms, Pañcamahāśabda, Pañcavisaravādya and Pañcōruvādya. The meaning given is, on the authority of the work Vivekacintāmaṇi, a horn, a tabour, a conch-shell, a kettledrum, and a gong. The explanation, on the authority quoted, follows the classification given above in the Tamil Nighanṭus. It thus becomes clear that the term Pañcamahāśabda has the recognized meaning of five *vādyas* or musical instruments which

produce the five classes of sounds. A combination of these five in one form or another constitutes the Indian band, and the term when applied to individuals or institutions ordinarily means the dignity of using the Indian band.

In its application the term assumes ordinarily the form Samadhigata-pañcamahāśabda, and this term is commonly used in inscriptions found in the Kanarese country. In several of these the term is actually used in place of "Śrīman-Mahārājādhirāja Parameśvara," thus indicating that it is of almost equal importance to the term it supersedes. It is found generally in application to Sāmantas (or feudatories), and continues to be used even after the feudatory family had set itself up as an independent ruling family. The early Hoysala rulers use the term in their Śāsanas, and this is applied to Narasiṁha II, the son of Viṣṇuvardhana.[1]

The following eight records among a large number give the range and variety of application of the title:—

	Year.	Overlord.	Title held by, or applied to.
1.	A.D. 913 (Sorab 88).	.. Akālavarṣa ..	Viṭṭarasa, Governor of Banavase, 12,000.
2.	A.D. 1118 (Shimoga 57).	.. Chāḷukya Vikramāditya	Jain Ācārya Prabhācandra Siddhānta Deva.
3.	A. D. 1031 (Shikarpur 30).	.. ChāḷukyaJayasiṁha.	Governor of Śantalige 1,000.
4.	A.D. 1077 (Shikarpur 44).	.. Vikramāditya VI.	Barmma Deva, Banavase 12,000 and Śantaḷige 1,000, also Mahāsenādhipati, Mahāpradhāna, Daṇḍanāyaka.
5.	A.D. 1151 (Shimoga 79).	.. Kūḍli Śriṅgeri Maṭha	Śaṅkarācārya.

[1] *Ep. Car.* vol. 1, pt. 1, Sr. 74.

	Year.	Overlord.	Title held by, or applied to.
6.	A.D. 1159 (Shikarpur 18).	.. Bijjala ..	Kalacūrya usurper Bijjala himself.
7.	A.D. 1155 (Shimoga 40).	.. ....	Viṣṇuvardhana Hoyśala.
8.	A.D. 1122 (Shimoga 12).	.. Vikramāditya VI ..	Gaṅga Permmāḍi Deva; Vikramāditya himself, apparently.

These eight records give the clearest indication that the term was applied to those who were entitled to make public appearances with the band playing, and include among them at least one emperor, two or three kings, a number of feudatories, and two Ācāryas, a Brahman and a Jain. There can, therefore, be no doubt that the term had no reference to any office, but gave a mere indication of dignity. That this was actually the case is clearly brought home to us in another record, *Epigraphia Carnatica*, Mysore, pt. 1, Nanjanagūḍ 164. This record refers itself to the reign of Rājendra I, Gaṅgaikoṇḍacola, and provides for the daily service at the Śiva temple at Nanjanagūḍ. The text runs:—

Vārṣakam ivam Īśāna Īśvaram Uḍaiyargge Koṭṭa tivari 1, *daṭṭa* 3, *khaṇḍikke* 3, *palam* 6, *jayagaṇṭe* 1, *pa.* 3, *kāḻe* 3, *pala* 1, *āgal i pañcamahāśabdavam trikāla bājisuvadakke*, etc.

This means, we shall make annual provision for the playing, three times a day, of the great band composed of five sounds for which we make a gift of 1 *tivari* (trumpet ?), 3 *daṭṭa*, 3 *khaṇḍikke*, 1 *jayagaṇṭe* (bell) and 3 *kāḻe* (horn). It is not a matter of much consequence to our purpose what these instruments actually were; but the term Pañcamahāśabda is here clearly equated with the band used for temple service. It is further obvious that the number was not of the first importance, nor the actual instruments that composed the band; it was merely a band. Perhaps the one essential was that the five different methods of producing musical sound must be represented. Pañcamahāśabda in Southern usage, therefore, had reference to the dignity of going in public with the band playing, whether or not the individual of this dignity held a civil or military or even a holy office.

Does Kalhaṇa use it in a different sense in the Rājataraṅgiṇī? The term actually occurs in stanza 140 of the Fourth Book. In regard to this the translator Sir Aurel Stein makes the following remarks in a foot-note:

> "One passage is of interest, as it clearly establishes, at least for Kashmir, the significance of the term *Pañcamahāśabda* often met with in ancient inscriptions and grants from other parts of India. The term has been correctly explained, in the sense indicated by our passage, as the five titles commencing with *Great*, by Professors Bühler, Kielhorn, Mr. Fleet and others; compare *Indian Antiquary*, IV, pp. 106, 180, 204; XIII, 134. Another explanation, first suggested by Sir W. Elliot, *Indian Antiquary*, V, 251, would refer the term to the privilege of using certain musical instruments conferred on vassels as a mark of honour. The number five is supposed to be connected with the beating of these instruments five times a day, or to relate to five different instruments used for this purpose. The evidence adduced l.c. and *Ind. Ant.* XII, p. 95, XIV, p. 202, does, however, not appear sufficiently old to establish this interpretation as to the original sense of the term." [2]

We have already explained above the significance of the term as it occurs in inscriptions of a period not much removed from that to which the reference in Kalhaṇa belongs. Kalhaṇa relates the history of Lalitāditya-Muktāpīḍa's war against Yaśovarman, and the treaty that was to have brought the war to a close. Yaśovarman suffered defeat and was to enter into a treaty with the victor who entrusted the commission to his Minister for Foreign Affairs (Sandhivigrahin), Mitraśarman. The draft of the treaty composed in Yaśovarman's Chancery was brought to Mitraśarman for his approval, but he took strong exception to the form of the treaty beginning with the name of Yaśovarman, Muktāpīḍa's name following, to the disgust of the warworn, and therefore impatient, generals of the Kashmir army. Muktāpīḍa approved of his minister's zealous loyalty and conferred upon him "pañcamahāśabdabhājanam," completely uprooting Yaśovarman at the same time. The following stanza makes the statement that thenceforward five offices from among the eighteen which had long been in existence were raised to a higher dignity than these eighteen, and the five higher officers were the Mahāpratīhāra (Lord High Chamberlain), Mahāsandhi-

[2] Stein, *Kalhana's Chronicle of Kashmir*, I, p. 133.

vigraha (Great Minister for Peace and War). Mahāśvaśāla (Great Commander of Horse), Mahābhāṇḍāgāra (Lord High Treasurer). and Mahāsādhanabhāga (Great Minister for Supply Transport and Military Stores). Even kings like the chief of the Śāhi regarded it not beneath their dignity to accept the directorship of one or other of these departments.

The question then arises whether, in the context, there is justification for the interpretation by Sir Aurel Stein of the term "pañcamahāśabdabhājanam," as he has actually done. There is no doubt about the last part bhājanam meaning "enjoyment". What is Pañcamahāśabda, and what is there in the context to refer to five offices beginning with *Mahā* having been conferred upon the individual Mitraśarman? The sovereign was pleased at the exhibition of zeal for the sovereign's dignity on the part of the minister (Sandhivigraha), and conferred upon him as a reward, the dignity of going about in public with the band playing. There is nothing more in stanza 140 than the addition that Yaśovarman was made to suffer for the want of tact on the part of his foreign minister. The following stanza states that Muktāpīḍa selected five offices from among the usual eighteen to raise these to a higher status than the eighteen. The next following stanza and a half enumerate the five, and give the names with the prefix *Mahā* added. In regard to the second of these Kalhaṇa prefixes a *sa* which refers to a something already referred to, and seems to imply that Mitraśarman had been made a Mahāsandhivigraha by being given the right to enjoy the Pañcamahāśabda. This creation of the five offices seems to have followed as a consequence of the elevation of one minister. The fact that these are referred to in the plural in the second half of stanza 143 seems to give a clear indication that they were held separately by separate individuals, and not conjointly by one pluralist. Lalitāditya seems to have exercised his own discretion in the choice of the officers for promotion to the higher dignity, as some of those thus honoured seem so much out of the common, viz., Mahāśvaśāla and Mahāsādhanabhāga. The first of these seems to refer unmistakably to the Commander of the Cavalry, and the other to the Director of Military Stores, Transport and Supply, etc. If under Harṣa the Commander of Elephants, Skandagupta, occupied a posi-

tion of privilege, it is possible that a cavalry commander had a similar honour under another monarch as a mark of personal esteem. The term *sādhana* occurs in the Ajanta inscription of the Vākāṭaka officer Hastibhoja in connection with Pṛthivīṣéna I,[3] and seems to mean something like material of war. Muktāpīḍa probably had his own reasons for selecting these officers for elevation. That is however not material to our inquiry. Mahasenāpati, Mahādaṇḍanāyaka and Mahāsandhivigrahin seem the usual officers who had this signal mark of the sovereign's esteem. Mahāsāmanta and Mahāpratīhāra seem not rare. Even combination of offices does not appear to have been rare. All these notwithstanding, the question is whether Kalhaṇa's text before us warrants the interpretation put upon it that Mitraśarman had the honour of holding simultaneously the five offices enumerated. The context does not appear to warrant it, and the meaning given to Pañcamahāśabda seems forced in the context.

I should like to invite attention to a note on the subject by the late Dr. Fleet in his volume on Gupta Inscriptions, page 296, note 9. The points calling for remark in that note are :—

1. That Mr. S. P. Pandit pointed out "that it was usual to accept the term as referring to the sounds of five musical instruments"
2. A commentary on Tulasīdās's Rāmāyṇa gives the same explanation, and notes that the five sounds were that of *tantrī* (lute), *tāl* (bell, metal drum played with a stick), *jhanjh* (cymbal), *nagārā* (kettle drum), and a wind instrument. This is in subansttial agreement with the explanation given above.
3. It is worthy of remark that the terms pañcamahāśabda, aśeṣapañcamahāśabda, and aśeṣamahāśabda are used more or less synonymously.
4. Among the paramount sovereigns who enjoyed this title there were two : (1) Amoghavarṣa, and Kakka, with dates respectively, Śaka 788 and 679.

---

[3] *Varṣaśatam abhivardhamāna-kośa-daṇḍa-sādhana-santāna-putra-pauttriṇaḥ, A.S.W.I.* vol. 4, p. 120, plate II.

5. There is one instance that Fleet quotes in which it is clearly stated that a Mahāsāmanta was given the pañcamahāśabda. It occurs in the Devgaḍh inscription of Bhoja Deva of Gwalior dated V. S. 919, where the Mahāsāmanta Viṣṇu is given the epithet tat-*pradatta*-pañcamahāśabda.

I may add here a few other instances of the occurrence of the term which are likely to throw light upon its meaning :—

1. *Epigraphia Indica*, volume 10, No. 14, the Noḷamba King Mahendrādhirāja, circa A.D. 891, is given the attribute "Samadhigata-pañcamahāśabda".
2. *Ibid.* No. 19 of Śaka 697 contains "Samadhigata-pañcamahāśabda-mahāsandhivigrahādhikṛta-sāmanta-śrīmad-Dallena".
3. *Ibid.* vol. 4, p. 24, ll. 7-9. In this grant of the Eastern Gaṅgas, the attribute is ascribed to the whole family of the Gaṅgas, and is said to have been obtained through the favour of Candramauḷi Gokarṇeśvara of Mahendragiri. The term itself occurs amidst others which would positively bar the interpretation that it has anything to do with the conferment of offices; the passage is "Gokarṇasvāminaḥ prasādāt samāsāditaika-śaṅkha-bheri-pañcamahāśabda-dhavaḷacchatra-hema-cāmara-vara-vṛṣabha-lāñchana-samujjvala-samasta-sāmrājya," etc.

APPENDIX.

KALHANA'S TEXT.

Śrī-Yaśovarmaṇaḥ sandhau sāndhivigrahiko na yat
nayam niyamanālekhe Mitraśarmāsya cakṣame। 137
so'bhūt sandhi Yaśovarma-Lalitādityayor iti
likhitenāḍi nirdeśā danarhatvam vidan prabhōḥ ॥ 138
sudīrgha-vigrahāśāntaiḥ sénānībhir asūyitām
āucityāpekṣatām tasya kṣitibhṛd bahv amanyata ॥ 139
prītaḥ pañcamahāśabda-bhājanam taṁ vyadhatta saḥ
Yaśovarma-nṛpaṁ taṁ tu samūlam udapāṭayat ॥ 140
aṣṭādaśānām upari prāk siddhānāṁ tadudbhavaiḥ
karmasthānaiḥ sthitiḥ prāptā tataḥ prabhṛti pañcabhiḥ ॥ 141

mahāpratīhāra pīḍa sa mahāsandhivigrahaḥ
mahāśvasālāpi mahābhāṇḍāgārāś ca pañcamaḥ 142
mahāsādhanabhāgaś cetyetā yair abhidhaḥ śrutāḥ
śāhimukhyā yeṣv abhavann adhyakṣāḥ prithivībhujaḥ ||
143

(Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī, IV, 137-43.)

TRANSLATION.

(137) In the peace with Yaśovarman, the form that his Minister for Foreign Affairs adopted as proper, Mitraśarman declined to tolerate.

(138) The document beginning "the treaty between Yaśovarman and Lalitāditya", he remained (convinced) was hardly appropriate to his sovereign.

(139) Though disgusting to the generals, tired of the protracted war, this desire for propriety (in Mitraśarman) received the approval of the king.

(140) Pleased, he (the king) bestowed upon him the enjoyment of "the five great sounds". King Yaśovarman, on the contrary, he destroyed 'root and branch'.

(141) Above the eighteen (departments) of old standing, he raised five from among them to a position of a higher standing from thenceforward.

(142) The position of Mahāpratīhāra, that of Mahāsandhivigraha, the Mahāśvasāla and Mahābhāṇḍāgāra; the fifth,

(143) Mahāsādhanabhāga, these names the five were given; among which the headship was held (even) by kings like the Chief Śāhis.

August 1925.

KERALA-NĀṬAKA-CAKRA

BY K. RAMA PISHAROTI

GOVERNMENT ARCHÆOLOGIST

COCHIN STATE

(*Communicated by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar.*)

KERALA is probably the only place in the whole of India where Sanskrit dramas are staged in the orthodox antiquated fashion: and the local temple theatre, where alone such staging is allowed, has been the most popular recreation-place for all high caste Hindus. The local stage has a long history behind it, going back to the days of at least the later Perumāḷs, the Imperial suzerains of Kerala. If tradition is to be believed, it reached the acme of perfection during the days of the last two of the Perumāḷs, who were not only great poets but past masters in the art of histrionics. Aided by Tholan, their minister and favourite; they are reported to have introduced many innovations in the stage practice to make the stage more popular and realistic. This tradition is more or less confirmed by the opening words of Vyaṅgya-vyākhyā wherein the Imperial dramatist commanded its author " to sit in judgment on the stage-merit of his drama which the king himself acted."[1] When it is remembered that the sway of the Perumāḷs was finally over at the latest by the end of the eighth century, when it is remembered that there is no other tradition of a stage reformation, it may readily be conceded that the local Sanskrit stage may justly be proud of its antiquity. Add to this the numerous restrictions imposed upon the actors and their acting[2], the various peculiarities in their get-up and their mode of representation, our stage becomes an interesting subject of study not merely to the student of the Sanskrit theatre but also to the student of antiquities. A thorough study of this ancient theatre of ours deserves to be made as early as possible, for it is gradually waning, or more correctly

---

[1] T. S. S., vol. 2, pp. 2, 3.

[2] The more important of these are given in my paper, "Acting in Kerala," published in the *Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society* (Bangalore).

has already waned, in popularity. Attempts are being made to collect all materials available, but the custodians of these, the Cākyārs, keep them so jealously that they are not prepared to part with them even to their intimate friends. And no wonder. Practising as they do the most antique of arts, they have not yet come within the pale of modern influences. In what follows it is proposed to give the names of the various dramas and their Acts which are or have been popular on our stage.

According to the tradition of the Cākyārs the number of Acts in which they can train themselves or are trained is seventy-two, including one-act dramas and Prahasanas. Excepting a few, they have all been identified and they are the following:—

1. Subhadrā-Dhanaṁjaya.
2. Tapatī-saṁvaraṇa.
3. Nāgānanda.
4. Mahānāṭaka.

(The different Acts of these four dramas, Nos. 1-4, have no special names. At least I have not yet been able to find out their names.)

5. Bhagavad-ajjuka.
6. Mattavilāsa.
7. Kalyāṇa-saugandhika.
8. Madhyama-vyāyoga.
9. Śri-kṛṣṇa-dūta or Dūta-vākya.
10. Dūta-ghaṭotkaca.
11. Karṇa-bhāra or Karṇa-kavaca.
12. Ūrubhaṅga.

(Nos. 5-12 have only one Act each, named as above.)

13. Pañcarātra.

(The names of two of the Acts are available. They are: Vettāṁka, and Bhīṣma-dūtāṁka.)

14. Avimāraka.

(The names of the first five Acts have been obtained. They are: (*a*) Āneṭṭāṁkam, (*b*) Dūtāṁkam, (*c*) Abhisariyāṁkam, (*d*) Parvāṁkam, and (*e*) Mādameṭṭāṁkam.)

15. Āścarya-cūdāmaṇi.

(The following are the names of the various Acts: (*a*) Parṇaśālāṁkam, (*b*) Śūrpaṇakhāṁkam, (*c*) Māyā(Sītā)ṁkam, (*d*) Jaṭāyuvadhāṁkam, (*e*) Aśokavanikāṁkam, and (*f*) Aṅgulyāṁkam.)

16. Abhiṣeka-nāṭaka.

(The Acts are named and they are: (*a*) Bāli-vadham, (*b*) Toraṇa-yuddham, and (*c*) Māyā-śirasāṁkam. The names of other Acts are not available.)

17. Pratimā-nāṭaka.

(The various names of the Acts are : (*a*) Vicchinnābhiṣekāṁkam. (*b*) Vilāpāṁkam, (*c*) Pratimāṁkam, (*d*) Aṭavyamāṁkam, (*e*) Rāvaṇāṁkam, (*f*) Bharatāṁkam, and (*g*) Abhiṣekāṁkam.)

18. Pratijñā-yaugandharāyaṇa.

(The Acts are named as follows : (*a*) Mantrāṁkam, (*b*) Mahāsenāṁkam, and (*c*) Ārāṭṭāṁkam.)

19. Svapna-vāsavadatta.

(The six Acts are respectively known as : (*a*) Brahmacāryāṁkam, (*b*) Pantāṭṭāṁkam, (*c*) Pūttūdāṁkam. (*d*) Śephālikāṁkam, (*e*) Svapnāṁkam, and (*f*) Citraphalakāṁkam.)

20. Bālacarita.

(One out of this is termed Mallāṁkam. The names of the other Acts have not yet been obtained.)

21. Cārudatta.

(According to a Cākyar, one of the Acts of this drama is known as Vasantasenāṁkam.)

22. Śrī-kṛṣṇa-carita.
23. Unmāda-vāsavadatta.
24. Śākuntala.

These twenty-four dramas are connected with our stage. They may broadly be classed under the heads : (*a*) those that are popular even to-day, (*b*) those that have been once popular and (*c*) those that are only traditionally reported to be popular. Under the first head may be included the first four, the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth and the eighteenth. Under the head (*c*) come the last three dramas mentioned above and of these two are yet unknown, while the last was put on the boards only once. Under the head (*b*) may be put down all the rest of the dramas in the above list.

Dhanaṁjaya and Tapatī-saṁvaraṇa are the productions of the immediate predecessor of the last of the Perumāḷs. They are written for the Kerala stage and by a Kerala prince. They have

also each a commentary written by the contemporary of the author from the actors' point of view. These commentaries are, therefore, very important documents for the students of the Kerala stage, though Dr. Sastri of Trivandram has not thought them fit for publication. I have not yet been able to procure copies of the same.

Nāgānanda has been and is still a very popular drama on our stage, a popularity which may to a great extent be explained by the fact that Kerala was the last stronghold of Buddhism in all India. This drama has taxed the actors' and the stage-managers' ingenuity to the last limit. Tradition says that even the fourth act used to be realistically staged, the actor impersonating Garuḍa actually flying through the air! The last successful flight was made at Iriñjalakuda, when the actor actually rose out of the temple stage and flew through the air and safely perched on the top of a hill about half a mile to the north of it. The hill is even now known as "Kutu-parambu." About two centuries ago the last attempt at flight under the patronage of the then Maharaja of Cochin at Kurikad, the then headquarters of the Prince, which is a village a couple of miles away from Tripunithura. But it ended unsuccessfully, for the actor who is to manipulate the "cords"—I don't know the exact significance of the words—failed in his work and consequently the *flier actor* came to grief. Since then the attempt has not been repeated. It will form a valuable addition to our knowledge, if complete directions regarding this attempt at flying can be got. Attempts are being made to gain the work dealing with this. The second Act of the drama, containing suicide scene is being acted even now. A pretty long piece of cloth is twisted round and round with a noose made at one end, while the other end is fixed to the ceiling. The actress—for women alone are allowed to impersonate female characters—inserts her neck in noose and rushes down in a giddy whirl about five or six feet. From their point of view it is an achievement of which any one may be proud.

Mahānāṭaka is traditionally looked upon not as an unoriginal drama, composed of extracts from various works. The one peculiarity connected with it is that it is the only drama that is allowed to be acted during day, all the others being staged only at night.

The Bhagavadajjuka is an unpublished little Prahasana, which has once been very popular on our stage. One Cākyār tells me that he has got an exceedingly elaborate commentary for the work detailing how to stage it and I am waiting to get a copy of it before preparing the text for publication.[1] The text proper does not contain the name of the author but the colophon in one of the manuscripts in the Paliam Library assigns it to Bodhāyana. This and the Mattavilāsa constitute the two farces popular on our stage.

The Kalyāṇa-saugandhika, recently published in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* (vol. 3, pp. 34 ff.), is a popular drama for two reasons. In the first place it is supposed to be the work of a Cākyār, and secondly it affords excellent scope for acting. The famous Ajāgaranṛttam is connected with this play.

Amongst the five one-act dramas, included in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, the most popular is Dūta-vāya or Śrī-kṛṣṇa-dūta, as the Cākyārs name it. The other dramas also are staged because extracts from these are found included in a manuscript which gives in order the various scenes to be staged in a temple in Travancore. Pañcarātra, and Avimāraka, though they have been popular as stage plays, are not found commonly staged. It is true that from the point of view of dramatic literature they must occupy a second position. But, as in the case of Kalyāṇa-saugandhika, these also afford enough materials for the Cākyārs to act.

The Cūḍāmaṇi, Abhiṣeka and Pratimā—these three together constitute the twenty-one Acts depicting the story of Śrī-Rāma.[2] All these Acts have been very popular, though at present our professional actors act only a few select scenes. These three dramas are known amongst Cākyārs as Ceriya-abhiṣekam, Vālia-abhiṣekam and Pādukā-abhiṣekam.

Of the next three dramas, at least one act of each is popular even now, the Mallāṁkam of Bālacarita. Regarding Cārudatta, I have not been able to gain any positive proof of its stage popularity. Śrī-kṛṣṇa-carita yet remains to be discovered, at least identified. Some Cākyārs say that Mallāṁkam is from Śrī-kṛṣṇa-carita and the colophon in the local manuscript of Bālacarita calls one of its

[1] The Manuscript has since been received.

[2] Cf. Kunhan Raja, *Zeitschr. f. Ind. u. Iran.* vol. 2, p. 260.—V.S.S.

acts Mallāṁkam, in which case Śrī-kṛṣṇa-carita may be identified with Bālacarita.

Unmāda-Vāsavadatta, which is a work of Śakti-bhadra, the author of Cūḍāmaṇi, may have been a popular stage-play, but it is not yet available. Śākuntala, tradition says, was once put on boards ; but when the Cākyār acted the opening scene, his eyes burst, when he looked, as the scene requires, at two objects in opposite directions. After this it has never been tried on the local stage.[1]

Enough has now been said to show that many dramas have been popular on our stage, the total number of acts prepared for the stage being seventy-two according to the verbal testimony of a Cākyār. If this be true, some more dramas have yet to be discovered, and it is to be hoped that in due course these will also be brought to light.

May, 1925.

---

[1] Cf. Kunhan Raja, *op. cit.* p. 251.—V.S.S.

PRINCE ŚAMBHĀJĪ AS A POET

By H. D. Velankar

Wilson College, Bombay

(*Communicated by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar.*)

In 1920 I was entrusted with the work of preparing a descriptive catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts of this Society. While doing this I came across an incomplete Sanskrit manuscript which on close inspection was found to contain a Sanskrit work called Budhabhūṣaṇa, claiming for its author King Śambhu, popularly known as Sambhājī, son of Śivājī the Great.

The book is apparently divided into three chapters, not clearly distinguished from each other. The first contains 194 verses, mostly Subhāṣitas, which are quotations from well-known authors, rendered popular owing to their strikingness, but often the sources of which are unknown. The first seventeen verses are introductory; they contain a brief history of the author's family, written in good easy Sanskrit and, together with the next eleven stanzas containing a hymn to Goddess Bhavānī, are the only few lines which are directly from the author's pen. The first six of these contain praises offered to Gajānana, Śiva, Guru and Pārvatī. The next ten are rather important. I subjoin an English translation of these.

(Stanza 7.) There was a king called Śahā (Śahājī), who was the Indra of the earth, who was skilled in Politics and Fine Arts, whose deeds were brave and noble, whose fame was extensive and who was the Moon rising from the midst of the ocean in the form of the family of Bhṛśabalas (*i.e.*, Bhosales);

(8) who worshipped the earth with an offering of the multitudes of the heads of hostile princes, which were severed (from their trunks) by a volley of arrows discharged from his bow, which was drawn right up to the ear—to him, the lofty crest jewel of numerous princes, was born the primeval Lord (*i.e.*, Viṣṇu) as his son, known widely by the name Śivājī.

(9) Victorious is Śiva, the invincible Chatrapati (Lord of the Umbrella), who is (none but) the lord of the world (*i.e.*, God Viṣṇu) who has assumed a partial incarnation, having seen the whole reli-

gion in distress, as it was bitten by the venomous serpent in the form of the Kali age.

(10) Śiva—who in the course of the Buddha incarnation of Gopāla, while Kali was yet in his full strength on earth (lit. had not yet declined), set up the Brahmins and the other castes on a firm foundation in their respective walks of life, by vanquishing the enemies of the gods,—with a view to protecting and reviving the caste religion, which had been violently disturbed by the Mlecchas:

(11) Having built fortresses for the protection of the earth on the best of the mountains unbearable (inaccessible) to the enemies, though called Sahya, between Karnāṭaka on the one hand and Bāglāna on the other and between the river Kṛṣṇā and the ocean (western), he, the foremost among the kings, reigns victorious in the inaccessible fort called Rairi.

(12) He conquered the whole of the earth from the eastern mountain to the western ocean and from the Setu (Adam's Bridge) to the mountain of cold (*i.e.*, the Himalayas), and made all princes pay tribute to him. Having learnt the duties prescribed by the Śrutis, declared to him by the learned, he shines, day by day, on his throne, after the coronation ceremony, by means of such symbols of royalty as the Chatra, etc. ;

(13) who being a victorious prince, satisfied, on the festive occasion of his coronation, the Brahmins, who had come from different places—with countless gifts of coins, garments, elephants and horses; and thus spread in all directions his fame, fit to be sung by gods and resembling in its purity, the lustre, which shoots out from the Moon.

(14) He it is whose fort shines with palaces and mansions in which princes dwell, with arches and beautiful market-squares, with new lakes filled with water all around, with learned priests, physicians and astrologers, with honest hereditary ministers and with the numberless brave armies of four kinds.

(15) His son who is the crest jewel of all the feudatory chiefs and who is well versed in (lit. has crossed the ocean in the form of) Poetry, Rhetoric, Purāṇas, Music and Archery, is famous by the name Śambhu.

(16) That King Śambhuvarmā is compiling this excellent book, having carefully read the works of the ancient writers and having taken his material from them.

(17) May the wise accept what is good and give up what is bad, having carefully gone through our work; Rājahaṁsas, indeed, accept milk having abandoned water mixed with it.

This is purely an introduction which is followed by the work proper.

This is, however, introduced by a hymn of eleven stanzas, addressed to Bhavānī and composed by the author himself, who naturally begins his work with a hymn to his favourite deity in order to secure uninterrupted completion.

This hymn is followed by fifteen stanzas (29-43) in praise of different deities, then by eighteen stanzas (44-61) expressive of benedictions, both culled out from well-known ancient works. Last of all come the Anyoktis in 130 stanzas (62-191) followed by three stanzas which are instances of a kind of literary puzzle known as Antarlāpikā (192-194).

The second chapter, which forms the main body of the work, contains 632 verses treating of politics. The author here deals with the following subjects, of course always in verses cited from other works, usually from the Matsya and the Viśṇudharmottara Purāṇas and the Kāmandakīyanītisāra :—

The king and his qualifications (1-31); his assistants, (32-46); the prime minister (47-71); the princes, their education and duties (72-91); King's advisers (92-96); the other component parts of a kingdom (a) kośa (97-106), (b) rāṣṭra (107-110), (c) durga and its equipment (111-186), (d) bala, *i.e.*, the army (187-198); King's duties (199-203); spies (204-215); attendants (216-241); councillors and the counsel (242-273); ambassador (274-284); King's duties (285-321); King's vices (322-367); invasion (368-396); King's duties in general (397-632).

The third chapter contains miscellaneous information useful to princes and is, therefore, called the Miśrakanītiprakaraṇa. Our manuscript contains 57 stanzas of this chapter and a portion of the 58th.

As regards the authorship of the work, the general opinion of the reader of the Maratha history is against ascribing any literary activities to Prince Sambhājī. The writers of the chronicles of the Maratha history, both old and new, leave an impression on the mind of the reader that Sambhājī, though brave, was incapable of anything worthy of praise. There is, however, nothing in them to show that Sambhājī was illiterate. Direct references to his literary merits and achievements cannot, of course, be expected in these chronicles whose sole aim was to narrate the political events of a particular period. We may, at the most, expect to get some casual references and as a matter of fact we do get some from which it is possible to conclude that not only had Sambhājī received education at the hands of learned Pandits, but he had also a taste for Sanskrit literature and was occasionally in the habit of writing poetry in Hindi under the influence of Kavi Kalaśa or the celebrated Kaluṣā, especially when passing his leisure hours in the company of beautiful women. The most explicit passage in this connection is that occurring on page 75 of Citragupta's chronicle of Śivājī the Great. It refers to an incident which took place after Śivājī's escape from Delhi, together with Prince Sambhājī. Being hotly pursued by Aurangzeb's men, Śivājī was compelled to leave the Prince with a Pandit named Kāśīpant at Benares. The learned Pandit taught him together with other boys, as though he were a Brahmin boy. But even this would not satisfy the crafty officers of the Mogul Emperor. The Pandit then had to eat in the same dish with Sambhājī in order to convince them that Sambhājī was a Brahmin and not a Maratha. "He then made atonements (for the sin thus committed). He began to impart instructions to him in general literature, and made him well versed in Sārasvata (grammar), Amarakośa, Raghuvaṁśa, Siddhāntakaumudī, (Siddhānta-)Muktāvali and similar other works. He, *i.e.*, Sambhājī became very clever." According to another chronicle (Marāthī Sāmrājyācī Choṭī Bakhar, *i.e.*, a short history of the Maratha empire, p. 32), the period during which he stayed there was about one year. If we believe in the Chroniclers, it is not impossible to maintain that Sambhājī obtained at least an elementary knowledge of the Sanskrit language during this forced stay of his at Benares.

Another passage which refers to the care bestowed upon Sambhājī's education by King Śivājī is found on page 20 of the 91 articled chronicle of King Śivājī. There, one Umājī Pandit is said to have been appointed to teach the Prince who was kept at Śṛngārpūr.

From the passages quoted above, we can safely conclude that Prince Sambhājī did receive at least an elementary knowledge of the Sanskrit language and literature during his boyhood. But there appear to have been original letters from which we can judge that he had kept up the habit of reading Sanskrit during his leisure hours till his advanced age. Thus, for instance, Kincaid and Parasnis, in their *History of the Maratha People*, part 2, p. 58, remark :

" Although he [Sambhājī] spent most of his life campaigning he was by no means averse from study. He employed a learned man called Keśav Pandit Adhyakṣa, a friend of the great king to read with him Vālmīki's celebrated epic, the Rāmāyaṇa. As a reward he gave Keśav in 1684 A.D., 1,600 small silver coins known as laris. The king was moreover no mean versifier. He is known to have written two books of Hindi poetry. The first was called Nakhshikh, in which he described the pleasures of love. The second was named Nayakabhad. In it he sang the varying charms of the beauties who beguiled his leisure moments."

Even though the learned authors do not give the source of their information, we can presume that they have got it from some literary documents either in the form of letters or of chronicles.

We are of course aware that the incident herein referred to, cannot go to prove that King Sambhājī was a good Sanskritist. We do not surely expect a Sanskrit author to require the help of a Śāstrī for reading Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa. It must on the contrary be conceded that this is not a reference to the mere employment of a Purāṇik—though this is not entirely impossible—as a special reward consisting of silver coins is said to have been given to him for the services. But even this meagre knowledge of the Sanskrit language on the part of King Sambhājī, which at least we can safely presume from the incident, is enough for our purpose. For the compilation of a work of the type we have before us does not require profound knowledge of the language, especially when the author was a Prince who could command the services of learned Pandits.

All this, I hope, is sufficient to prove that King Sambhājī was the real compiler of the book before us. He may have been assisted by his Pandits in the task of selecting and arranging the quotations of which the work consists, but he was the principal figure. It proves at any rate that Sambhājī was fond of reading Sanskrit in the original and that he had the ambition of being called a Sanskrit poet.

The second part of the quotation from *A History of the Maratha People* given above is rather curious. It is based upon the recent researches of Mr. Purshottam Vishram Mawji, J.P., of Bombay as I learnt from the learned authors themselves. I am greatly indebted to Mr. Mawji, who very kindly handed over to me his own copy of a few stanzas selected from Sambhājī's two works of Hindi poetry. From these stray verses we can judge about the contents and form of the two poems. The first of these is called " Nakhaśikhā " in which the author gives a poetical description of the different parts of Rādhā's body from the nail of the foot (nakha) to the crest (śikhā). In the second, which is obviously a work on Rhetoric and is called " Nāyikābheda " (Nayakabhad in the quotation from the ' History ' is evidently a misprint), we find a description of the different sorts of heroines such as Madhyamā, Prauḍhā, Khaṇḍitā, etc., just after the fashion of the Sanskrit writers on Rhetoric. The few quotations that we have got disclose a close acquaintance on the part of our author with the Sanskrit works on Rhetoric.

Among the quotations we find one from the pen of the famous Kaluṣā. It is highly poetical and even though we unfortunately do not possess any literary remains of this great favourite of King Sambhājī, we have grounds to believe that he was a literary man. In the old chronicles he is described as Kavi Kalaśa or the poet Kalaśa. It was popularly believed that this Kanauj Brahmin had been purposely sent by the Emperor from Delhi and that he was a great enchanter. As a matter of fact we know this Kaluṣā did exert a wonderful influence upon the King but to what it was due we can simply guess. The origin of this influence is shrouded in obscurity. We shall not be, however, far from the truth in assuming that to a considerable extent his literary gifts helped Kaluṣā in maintaining his influence with the Prince. It is quite possible

that this Kavi Kaluṣā may have composed several poems, which were not preserved owing to the general disfavour in which he was held, but stray copies of which may yet have existed and might one day be discovered by us. We, on our part, are inclined to believe that the two Hindi poems (there may be more of the kind) are really from the pen of Prince Sambhājī, composed by him under the literary influence of Kalusā, who was certainly gifted with poetic talents.

July, 1925.

BRIEF NOTES

Nāga Worship in Kerala

Shrines set up for Nāgas are an invariable feature of every Malayalee house which has any pretence to orthodoxy or antiquity. Such shrines are looked upon with awe and dread, and the older generation at least treats them with as much respect as they would a temple. The commonness of the worship, the fear and dread attached to Nāgas and their shrines, show that at one time at least this worship occupied a prominent place in the life of the average Malayalee.

We come across three different types of Nāga shrines in these parts: (1) a Citrakūṭa (with or without Nāga idols and anthills); (2) Nāga idols (with or without Citrakūṭa and anthills); and (3) anthills (with or without idols and Citrakūṭa). The idols, when they stand alone, are sometimes found set up on a platform, which by itself may be taken as a proof of their modern age. The older shrines are generally found located in topes having a number of juicy trees, the more important being *Elanji*, *Pala*, *Veppu*, &c. There seems to exist no general rule regarding the number, the size and the shape of the idols to be set up in a shrine. These details, as also the site of the shrine, are to be settled by the astrologer. About the site there seems to exist only one rule and that is that the shrine must always face the house.

Though tradition lays down eight different kinds of Nāgas, no difference, it is said, is made in the cast of the idols in their worship in setting up a new shrine or in removing an old shrine. This is the opinion of one of the great traditional Nāga priests whom the writer questioned. Over and above the usual Nāga idol, with the body curled up and hood erect and spread, two more types are generally seen here: (1) the idol of Nāga, carrying a female or male sculptured upon it, and (2) the same having both male and female figures in different panels one above the other. The male figure, they say, represents *Nāgarāja*, while the female *Nāgayakṣī*. This connection with Yakṣi may be significant, but I incline to take it as meaning only Nāgarājñī.

The one distinguishing feature of the Nāga gods is that they are Sthala-devatās, *i.e.*, place deities, and not Kula-devatās or family deities. Two reasons may be given in favour of such a view. When a family migrates from one place to another, they leave behind their former Nāga gods, but *not* their Kula-devatās. Secondly, it is found to be a constant practice, especially in modern days—and this orthodoxy sanctions—to rid a place of its Nāga gods. These will show that they have no title to be called Kula-devatās. This suggests that the Nāgas are not the peoples' gods. From this one may conclude that the Nāgas are not the gods of Malayalees. Can it, then, be that these latter are emigrants to Kerala ?

Except in the houses of the great Nāga priests of the land, as for instance in Pambum-mekkat Illom, it is very doubtful if there be any shrine at which daily worship is offered to Nāgas. Commonly not even monthly worship is given. The worship, as found in practice, is always seasonal or annual, when *pālum* (milk), and *nīrum* (water) are offered by a Brahmin with something of the paraphernalia of a regular religious ceremony. However there is generally placed a lighted wick every day in the direction of the Nāga shrine and sometimes in the shrine itself, as is done to the family deity or ancestors.

Regarding the question as to what we are worshipping, whether the live serpents that pester us, or some superior beings, one Nāga priest is of opinion that live serpents are the lineal descendants of the eight divine Nāgas and the shrines set up represent both. In proof thereof is pointed out the particular practice of the members of the Nambudiri family, Pambum-mekkat, referred to above, the practice of giving any dead serpent they may see anywhere a proper ceremonial cremation. One does not seem to be quite satisfied with this view. The queer nature of the worship, the situation of the shrine, the absence of rule regulating the number and kind of images to be put up, the presence of the shrine called Citrakūṭa, their connection with the place,—these suggest the view that in this we may find a national type of ancestor worship. That is to say, in worshipping the Nāgas, Malayalees are, it seems to the writer, paying their homage and respect to the long, long lost race of people who originally inhabited this place, who were called Nāgas probably

because they were snake-worshippers or they came to be identified with serpents by the Aryans whose word Nāga meant snake. Further the Nāgas are said to be the denizens of Pātāla, which may well be identified with Kerala. When the Mahābhārata states that Arjuna married a Nāga-kanyakā, rational mind, like that of Vyāsa, cannot be expected to have in mind the hero's marriage with a she-serpent. To identify the Nāga-kanyakā with this is just like identifying Hanumān with an ordinary monkey. The writer, therefore, believes that the Puranic Nāgas are none other than human beings; hence he is tempted to connect the Nāgas with the original inhabitants of the land.

The Sthalapurāṇas explain the prominence of Nāga worship in the land in the following way. When Kerala was reclaimed from the sea by Paraśu Rāma, he found it very shaky. He had then to make it firm by burying down rich treasures and to guard these treasures he requested the lordly divine serpents. In return for this service he promised that his colonists would at all times worship them. And it is in obedience to the leader's desire that the Malayalees offer worship to the Nāgas even to-day. Such is the legendary account of how the Nāgas came to be universally worshipped here and it shows that the Nāga worship is conducted neither to court benefit nor to ward off evils.

A close scrutiny of this account tempts one to think that the snake referred to may be not a physical one but a *political* one, especially in view of the fact that Paraśu Rāma's reclamation and gift of the land to the Brahmins has been interpreted to mean discovery and Aryan colonisation. The view may be elaborated thus :—

After conquering the native population, the cave dwellers and the water dwellers, Paraśu Rāma established his colony, but found the natives least inclined to be conciliatory on account of the death of their numerous heroes. As a last measure of reconciliation, he suggested the worship of the departed heroes of the aborigines. Such an honouring might have pacified them and freed the land from all political convulsions.

If the views suggested above are acceptable we have in Nāga worship a national type of ancestor worship.

COCHIN STATE,
May 1925.

K. RAMA PISHAROTI.

Qiwāmī's Riddle

Qiwāmī Muṯarrizī, brother of the famous poet Nizāmī of Ganja wrote an "Artifice" or "Ornate poem" (قصیدهٔ مصنع), which is reproduced "line by line with prose translation and running commentary as to the nature of the rhetorical figures which it is intended to illustrate" by Professor Browne in his *Literary History of Persia*, vol. 2. It extends over a hundred verses and illustrates almost all important figures of speech generally used in Persian literature. Verses numbered 53-62 contain a *lughaz* or riddle. Their text with translation as given by Professor Browne runs as follows :—

چیست آن دور و اصل[1] او نزدیک
چیست آن فرد[2] و فعل آن بسیار

خام او هرچه عالم را پخته
مست او هر چه عقل را هشیار

دل شکن[3] لیک درد دل پیوند
خوش گذر لیک روزگار گذار

رنج او نزد بیدلان راحت
خوار او نزد[4] زیرکان دشوار

چون دعا خوش عنان و بی مرکب
چون قضا ره نورد و بی هنجار

اندوهش همچو لهو و[5] راحت بخش
آتشش همچو آب نوشگوار

نعره در وی شکنج موسیقی
ناله در وی نوای موسیقار

عشق اصلیست کز منازعتش
عقل غمگین بود روان غمخوار

[Variae lectiones :— [1]قهر [2]خرد [3]شکر [4]پیش [5]لهو راحت

خاصه عشق بتی که در غزلش
مدحت شاه می کنم تکرار
شاید از زان غزاله بنیوشد
زین[6] نوا این غزل بنغمهٔ زار

[6] این نوآئین

"What is that distant one, whose origin is withal near? What is that unique one, whose deeds are withal many?
Whose rawest [recruit] ripens whatever is knowledge; whose most drunken [dependent] gives sense to whatever is understanding.
A breaker of hearts, but a healer of hearts' ills; living pleasantly, but compelling fortune:
Whose pain is peace to those who have lost their hearts; whose easiest is hard to the intelligent.
Like prayer, light-reined and horseless: like Fate, a swift and unaccountable traveller.
Care for him is like play and a giver of ease; whose fire is like water, sweet to drink.
A cry in whom is a movement of music; a wail in whom is the melody of the shepherd's pipe.
Love is that element by whose struggles reason is rendered sorrowful and the spirit sad;
In particular the love of that idol in my love-songs to whom I repeat the praises of the king.
Therefore it were meet if the sun should listen graciously to the ode in this song set in plaintive strain."

After the above translation Professor Browne remarks "these riddles are generally very obscure, and I regret to say that of the one here given I do not know the answer." It is quite possible that this *lughaz* still remains a riddle to many of his readers. It is for the benefit of such readers as these that I give the *answer* as found in the text of the poem quoted in manuscript no. 9 belonging to the Government Collection of Persian and Arabic MSS. started by me some time ago. Against the first of the above couplets it is clearly put down therein in red ink

اللغز فی العشق]—from which it is clear that the riddle is on Love. Moreover it is confirmed by the hint which is thrown in verse no. 60, viz. عشق، اصلیست etc.

The variants given above are taken from the same manuscript, which was acquired in Poona. It is a composite MS. containing nine short treatises [1] on Persian Prosody, Rhyme, and Figures of Speech, four of which are unpublished, two are older than those in the British Museum, one does not appear to exist either in the British Museum or the Bodleian; another is neither in the India Office, the Bengal Asiatic Society's Library, nor in the Cambridge University Library. The variants given above speak for themselves and are as interesting as instructive. Some of them distinctly improve the text. The variant in the last line is noteworthy. It changes the entire sense of the verses numbered 61, 62, which would then mean "in particular the love of that idol in whose songs I repeat the praise of the king; it would be proper if he (king) were to listen to this ode, composed in new style, sung in melodious strain by that gazelle."

Verse no. 70, viz.

چهرهٔ روشنش کہ روز منست — زیر زلفش مهیست در شب تار

illustrates another figure of speech called Mujarrad, about which Professor Browne says it "is not mentioned in the books at my disposal, and I do not see wherein its peculiarity consists." Here again the Poona MS. comes to our help and elucidates the obscure figure. There it is called مجرد من الالف i.e., free from Alif, the letter Alif being deliberately dropped from the words used in the couplet.

What is called 'Mujarrad' here is also known as حذف or حذف الحروف or محذوف, which is so described by Maulawī

[1] قصیدهٔ مصنع سلمان ساوجی ـ حدائق شرف الرامی ـ عروض سیفی ـ رسالہ قافیہ عطاء اللہ ـ رسالہ قافیہ جامی ـ رسالہ عروض وطواط ـ تحفة الشعراء صفی اللہ ـ قصیدهٔ قوامی مطرزی ـ انیس العشاق شرف رامی

Ashraf 'Alī, first Professor of Persian in the Elphinstone College, Bombay, in his *Ashraf-ul-Insha* :—

حذف، در اصطلاح آنکه از انشاء و اشعار الزام حذف
حرفی از بیست و هشت حروف تهجی می نمایند

He then proceeds to give twenty-eight examples corresponding to the twenty-eight letters of the alphabet, in prose and poetry, from each of which a letter of the alphabet is deliberately dropped.

Of the remaining noticeable variants found in the Poona MS. I may mention the following :—

Verse no. 3, viz.

جود را برده از میانه میان — بخل را داده از کناره کنار

the MS. reads بردی and دادی for برده and داده, which is quite in keeping with Prof. Browne's translation, "*thou* hast caught, etc."

In verse no. 15, viz.

فلک افزون ز تو ندارد کس — ای فلک نیک گیر و نیکش دار

for نیک and فلک the MS. reads نغز and ملک, of which the first variant is decidedly better.

Verse no. 17 appears in Prof. Browne's text as follows :—

تیغ تو همچو آفتاب بنور — سیر دارد زمانه را ز نگار

"Thy sword, like the sun with its light, keep the world replete with pictures." (Br.).

In the MS. the second hemistich reads :

می زداید زمانه را زنگار

i.e., thy sword, like the sun with its light, removes the rust (of darkness) from the world. Evidently the reading of the MS. is the correct reading.

Verse no. 33 runs as follows :—

آردت فتح در مکان امکان — دهدت کوه بر فرار قرار

"Victory brings thee power in space ; the mountain [*i.e.*, thy steadfastness] gives thee endurance against flight." (Br.) The MS. gives the second line as دهدت کوه بر قرار اقرار, *i.e.*, the mountain admits thy steadfastness.

I give below verses numbered 43, 44, 45, 46, 51, 67, 68, 76, 79 and 82 in Prof. Browne's text as also the variants of the Poona MS. which speak for themselves.

چرخ از آزار تو نیازارد [1]	نیاز آرد [1]
بندگان را کجا کنی [2] آزار	رسد [2]
نارد از خدمت تو بیرون سر	
ورچه بشگافیش به نیزه چو مار [3]	نار [3]
دشمنانرا بداوری و خلاف	
با تقاضای [4] گنبد دوار	قضاهای [4]
قهر و کینت بباد داده چو خاک	
لطف و قهرت [5] بآب کشته چو نار	مهرت [5]
نکشد آب خصم آتش تو	
نشکند [6] تاب نور مهرهٔ مار	نکشد تاب مور [6]
سوخت [7] در آتشم چه می گویم [8]	این [7] گوئی [8]
احرقتنی الهوا بغیر النار [9]	لم تحرقتنی بهذا النار [9]
زار و زردم ز درد دوری تو	
درد دل دار [10] زرد دارد وزار	روي [10]
بر لبش [11] زلف عاشقست چو من	رخش [11]
لاجرم همچو منش نیست قرار	
آب آن [12] تیره آب [13] این روشن	[12] این [13] دُرّآن
آن [14] این گریه و آن او گفتار	این گه گریه و آن گه گفتار [14]

Elphinstone College,
August, 1925.

Shaikh Abdul Kadir.

A note on قلب الشتاء

In the text of the Marzubān Nāma edited by Mirzā Muhammad Qazwīnī, in the *Gibb Memorial Series*, p. 87, occur the following sentences :—

ماحضری که بود پیش بنهاد بکار بردند و آتشی خوش برافروختند و از لطف محاورات و مفاکهات فواکه روحانی باریحانی زمستانی برهم آمیختند و صیرفی طبع در رغبت قلب الشتاء هر ساعت این ابیات می‌خواند

بی صرفه در تنور کن آن زر صرف را
کو شعلها بصورة و عوا برافگند

طاوس بین که زاغ خورد و آنگه از گلو
گاورس ریزهای منقی براگند

The learned editor in a footnote on قلب الشتاء says :—

در یکی از نسخ در زیر قلب الشتاء نوشته "آتش" و معلوم نشد این معنی برای قلب الشتاء از روی چه مأخذی است

I venture to suggest that the مأخذ is given in the text itself. The قلب *i. e.* مقلوب of the word شتاء is آتش. Compare the following lines quoted in the Maqāmāt-e-Ḥamīdī (Maqāma xxiv, فی البرد):

من حکایات برد لیلتنا — خمدت فی الشتاء مقلوبة
قد هممنا بشربها فاذن — جمدت فی الاناء مشروبة

ELPHINSTONE COLLEGE,
August, 1925.

SHAIKH ABDUL KADIR.

Was Garga A Jaina ?

In the introduction to his edition of the famous Bower MS. Dr. Hoernle, at pp. cix ff., while referring to the MS. of Pāśakakevalī, has mentioned Garga as its author. Of course this name does not occur in the Bower MS. itself. But he compared this MS. with another (no. 70) in the then Deccan College MSS. Library, now at the Bhandarkar Or. Res. Institute and while concluding that the text in the Bower MS. represented the shortest and earliest recension of the Pāśakakevalī, says "the manuals. . . are ascribed to the authorship of the sage Garga" (p. xciii). He has omitted to enter into further details about the author.

Now, the MSS. library at the Bhandarkar Institute has in its possession six MSS. of Pāśakakevalī, of which the one referred to by the learned doctor, is one. This and two others have at the end "*Jaina* āsīd jagadvandyo Garganāmā mahāmuniḥ;" one has "ṛṣir āsīd, etc.;" another reads "yenāsīc ca jagad, etc.;" while the last, omitting all this reference, has in its colophon: ". . . Gautama-ṛṣi-viracita. . . . "

The last MS. which ascribes the authorship to quite a different person being entirely left out of consideration, there remain the references to Garga in five MSS. Of these again, the one mentioning Garga as a Ṛṣi drops away, as having a reading quite different from the others. And now the relation between "yenāsīc ca" in one MS. as against "Jaina āsīd" from three becomes interesting. The tradition of reading *ja* for *ya* is not new to Sanskritists ; even now the followers of the Yajurveda read the Puruṣa Sūkta with "jajñena jajñam" as against the "yajñena yajñam" of the Ṛgvedists. Thus the conclusion one would arrive at is that the original "yenā" was by somebody written "jenā" and then some learned copyist amended the reading and put it "Jaina" as rendering some sense. But the majority of the MSS. takes a stand against this conclusion, and besides, the construction "yenā, &c." with "ca" seems more artificial than the other.

But the literary tradition seems to support the single MS. which refuses to accept Garga as a Jaina. Garga is a Hindu author

of Jyotiṣa works of hoary antiquity and is quoted as an authority in many of the comparatively late books on Jyotiṣa. Nay, he is said, according to Purāṇic tradition, to be the first propagator of this science. The Bhāgavata has at x. 8. 5:

> jyotiṣām ayanam sākṣād yat tad jñānam atīndriyam |
> praṇītam bhavatā yena pumān veda parāvaram ||

said by Nanda addressing Garga, the Purohita of the Yadus.

What should the proper conclusion be in view of these conflicting statements?

S. N. TADPATRIKAR.

REPORTS AND SUMMARIES

I

"Deux nouveaux traités de dramaturgie indienne," par Sylvain Lévi. *Journal Asiatique*, Octobre-Decembre 1923, pp. 193-218.

In the valuable article entitled "Deux nouveaux traités de dramaturgie indienne," published in the number of the *Journal Asiatique* cited above, Professor Sylvain Lévi brings forward new and important material, gleaned from two unpublished books of the dramatic art, throwing some sidelights on various topics connected with the history of the Sanskrit drama. The treatises in question are: the Nāṭyadarpaṇa by Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra, and the Nāṭakalakṣaṇa-Ratnakośa (also known simply as Ratnakośa) by Sāgaranandin. The former work belongs to the end of the twelfth century; the date of the latter is not known with certainty.

THE NATYADARPANA.

The Darpaṇa, according to Lévi, is divided into four sections called *vivekas*. The first *viveka* is called *nāṭakanirṇaya*, the second *prakaraṇādyekādaśarūpakanirṇaya*, the third *vṛttirasabhāvābhinayavicāra*, and the fourth *sarvarūpakasādhāraṇanirṇaya*. The colophons of the sections give the names of the authors as Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra; the upasaṁhāra at the end of the work describes them as desciples of the celebrated Jaina encyclopædist Hemacandra.

The collaborators mention several times their own works (*asmadupajña*): Yādavābhyudaya, Rāghavābhyudaya, Sudhākalaśa, Mallikāmakaranda (prakaraṇa), and Vanamālā (nāṭikā). Aufrecht in his *Cat. Cat.* indicates as works of this Rāmacandra also the Nalavilāsa and the Raghuvilāsa. The Nāṭyadarpaṇa often cites these works without mentioning the name of the author. Another drama which passes as the work of Rāmacandra is the Satyahariścandra, which is spoken of, in the prologue, as the best of the

dramas composed by Rāmacandra, "the pupil of the great savant Hemacandra". In the colophon of this Satyahariścandra (as also of the Nirbhayabhīma), Rāmacandra is designated as "the author of a hundred works". Rāmacandra evidently had the ambition of emulating and even outdoing the achievements of his great Guru.

The Darpaṇa utilizes an extensive dramatic literature and contains numerous citations, mentioning at times the name of the authors. Besides classical pieces like the Abhijñānaśākuntala, Daridracārudatta, Mālatīmādhava, Mālavikāgnimitra, Mṛcchakaṭika, Mudrārākṣasa, Nāgānanda, Ratnāvali, Svapnavāsavadatta Uttararāmacarita, Veṇīsaṁhāra, Vikramorvaśī, Vīracarita, and some less celebrated works like Arjunacarita, Chalitarāma, Kṛtyārāvaṇa, Pāṇḍavānanda and so on, it cites not less than 21 plays, hitherto wholly unknown. These are: Abhinavarāghava (by Kṣīrasvāmin), Anaṅgasenāharinandin (by Śrī-Śuktivāsakumāra), Bālikāsaṁcitaka, Citrotpalāvalambitaka (by the Āmātya Śaṅkuka), Devīcandragupta (by Viśākhadatta), Hayagrīvavadha, Indulekhā, Kaumudīmitrānanda, Mallikāmakaranda, Manoramāvatsarāja (by Bhīmabhaṭa), Māyāpuṣpaka, Pārthavijaya, Pratimāniruddha (by Vasunāga, son of Bhīmadeva), Prayogābhyudaya, Puṣpavartiṭaka, Rādhāvipralambha (by Bhejjala), Sudhākalaśa, Vāsavadattānṛttavāra, Vidhivilasita, and Vilakṣaduryodhana.

Those who are interested in the Bhāsa controversy will feel indebted to Lévi for a quotation from the Svapnavāsavadatta of Bhāsa, who is specifically named in this connection. Lévi points out that neither the verse nor the context cited by the Darpaṇa is to be found in the Trivandrum Svapnavāsavadatta, although the cited passage has an exact counterpart in the anonymous text. In Bhāsa the king enters the śephālikā bower, sits down on the marble bench where Padmāvatī had been sitting, and recites the verse:

pādākrāntāni puṣpāṇi soṣma cedaṁ śilāsanam |
nūnaṁ kācid ihāsīnā māṁ dṛṣṭvā sahasā natā ||
(sic.; corr. gatā.)

In the anonymous drama, on the contrary, it is the buffoon (Vidūṣaka) who observes: "*One may well guess that Madam Padmāvatī had come here and that she has gone away.*"—"*How dost thou know?*"

asks the king.—"*See these clumps of śephālikā from which flowers have been plucked*," replies the Vidūṣaka. "We find here," concludes Lévi, "dislocated elements of the authentic scene as written by Bhāsa; the re-edition (*remaniement*) has skipped the stanza of the King".

It has been pointed out elsewhere that the "dislocation" is probably not as serious as Lévi imagines it to be. All that may have happened is that the Darpaṇa stanza has dropped out in our version. To restore the text it seems necessary only to replace the stanza at the point where there is a hiatus in the Trivandrum version, namely, just before the words of the Vidūṣaka: *tattahodī Padumāvadī iha āacchia niggadā bhave.*

Lévi supposes that the Darpaṇa here expressly mentions Bhāsa as author (*Bhāsakṛte Svapnavāsavadatte*) in order to distinguish the authentic Svapnavāsavadatta from another (spurious?) play of the same name. We cannot but think that in this the learned French savant is gravely mistaken. We agree with Thomas (*JRAS.* 1925, p. 101), who on the contrary holds that the adjunct *Bhāsakṛta* was necessary "owing to a relative unfamiliarity of the public for which the Nāṭyadarpaṇa was written with the play or its authorship." Moreover, in view of the fact that Śūdraka, the celebrated author of the Mṛcchakaṭika, has also been named despite the fact that the play is sufficiently distinguished by its title from the Daridracārudatta (which is separately named in the Darpaṇa), Lévi's argument based on the alleged desire on the part of the authors for precision and discrimination loses all force and cogency.

Ganapati Sastri's view of the verse,

svañcitapakṣmakapāṭaṁ nayanadvāraṁ svarūpataḍitevа |
udghāṭya sā praviṣṭā hṛdayagṛhaṁ me nṛpatanūjā ||

is next the object of Lévi's animadversion. Lévi confesses his inability to follow the argument of the learned Sastri that since the verse "signifies the springing up of love for a lady at first sight. . . . it could not find a place in the Svapnavāsavadatta". We agree with Lévi so far; but we in turn must confess our inability to follow Lévi when he claims to recognize in the most innocuous and unequivocal statement of Abhinavagupta a clear indication of the desire on the part of the commentator to distinguish his Svapnavāsava-

-datta from some other drama of the same name. We take the view that the Locana verse could quite easily find a place in Bhāsa's Svapnavāsavadatta, and that it has been omitted along with some other verses, in the abridged, actors' edition of the drama, preserved in Kerala.

We will turn to another subject. The Darpaṇa contains lengthy quotations from a drama called the Devīcandraguptal, said to be by Viśākhadatta. These extracts are sufficient to give us a glimpse of the main plot of this drama. In the second Act of the play King Rāmagupta, in order to pacify his subjects, consents to the infamous stipulation of surrendering his royal consort. Dhruvadevī to the enemy king. But the brother of Rāmagupta, Prince Candragupta, refuses to subscribe to this degrading condition imposed by the tyrant. He proposes to take the place of the Queen at the rendezvous, which he does and secretly murders the infatuated Śaka king.

The mention of the Śaka does not suffice to set aside the identification of the hero with Candragupta Maurya. The Mudrārākṣasa names the Śakas (and even the Hūṇas) among the allies of Malayaketu. But the name of Dhruvadevī dissipates all doubts. Dhruvadevī (also known as Dhruvasvāminī) is well known, thanks to inscriptions as also a seal which bear her names and her titles, as the royal consort of Candragupta II and the mother of his successor Kumāragupta. King Rāmagupta, who appears in this play as the brother of Candragupta, is however not known from any other source. We know that Candragupta destroyed the sovereignty of the Kṣatrapa Śakas, and incorporated in his empire the provinces of Surāṣṭra and Mālava, which constituted their hereditary dominion. As for the amourous intrigue which brings about in the drama the downfall of the Śaka king, history knows nothing at all. But Bāṇa, the courtier and biographer of Harṣa Śīlāditya, is familiar with it; likewise his commentator Śaṅkara.

The plays Mālavikāgnimitra, Mudrārākṣasa and Devīcandragupta show that the genre of historical drama was not neglected in India. It is worthy of note that in the Devīcandragupta Rāmagupta is presented as the elder brother of Candragupta, Dhruvadevī as the royal consort of this Rāmagupta, and the downfall of the

Śaka dynasty is explained as the tragic issue of a gallant adventure. This arbitrary distortion of historical facts makes it impossible to maintain any longer, argues Sylvain Lévi, that the author Viśākhadatta was a contemporary of Candragupta II (as maintained by Speyer, Hillebrandt and Konow), or even of Skandagupta (as recently suggested by Charpentier, *JRAS.* 1923, 590). "It would be perhaps more appropriate to seek a date for him between the end of the Gupta dynasty and the beginning of the reign of Harṣa, near the commencement of the seventh century. But to be quite honest," concludes Lévi, "the question is not yet ripe for solution." We may point out in passing that Telang, nearly half a century ago, had given cogent reasons for placing the author of the Mudrārākṣasa in the seventh century.

THE NATYALAKSANA-RATNAKOSA.

Lévi's notice of the Ratnakoṣa, though much shorter, is not less valuable. This treatise on dramaturgy has been cited by a number of late commentators and authors: Rāyamukuṭa (in his commentary on the Amarakośa), Rucipati (on the Anargharāghva), Raṅganātha (on the Vikramorvaśī), the Kashmirian Jagaddhara (in his Sangītasarvasva), and so on.

Sāgara also utilizes an extensive dramatic literature, citing over 115 Sanskrit dramas, of which not less than 40 have hitherto not been known even by name. Among the classical dramas cited in the Ratnakośa are the following: Abhijñāna (-Śākuntala), Cārudatta, Karpūramañjarī, Mālatīmādhava, Mṛcchakaṭika, Mudrārākṣasa, Nāgānanda, Ratnāvali, Svapnavāsavadatta, Uttaracarita, Veṇīsaṁhāra, and Vikramorvaśī.

Besides the list of the dramas cited in the Ratnakośa, Lévi's notice of this treatise contains two citations from the text, both of which are of great value for the elucidation of the Bhāsa problem.

One of these citations is from the Cārudatta. Lévi points out that the Ratnakośa knows and cites on the other hand the Mṛcchakaṭika also; Sāgara thus distinguishes between the two works. From the Cārudatta he cites the stanza :

śuṣkadrumagato rauti ādityābhimukhaṁ sthitaḥ |
kathayaty animittaṁ me vāyaso jñānapaṇḍitaḥ ||
(corr. jīrṇapaṇḍitaḥ ?)

This stanza does not occur in the Mṛcchakaṭika. But the identical sentiments and many of the phrases recur, with slight variations, in the ninth Act of this drama, the ideas being spread out over two stanzas, one Anuṣṭubh and one Hariṇī. *A propos* of this Lévi remarks : " Once again the Mṛcchakaṭika gives one the impression of being a diluted edition (*reprise delayee*)". We cordially endorse the opinion of the learned French savant. Our own view is that the Cārudatta is a fragment, and that the first four Acts of this drama are the original on which the Mṛcchakaṭika is based, or at any rate they have preserved much of the original on which the Mṛcchakaṭika is based.

The other citation is from the prologue of the Svapnavāsavadatta. The extract in the Ratnakośa does not tally with the prologue of the Trivandrum drama. In Sāgara's citation the Stage-director announces the entry of Yaugandharāyaṇa, as is the case for instance in Śakuntalā. In the anonymous drama, the Stage-director on the other hand makes simply an observation of a general character, without any reference whatsoever to Yaugandharāyaṇa. From this discrepancy Lévi draws merely the obvious and incontravertible conclusion that the Trivandrum Svapnavāsavadatta is not identical with the drama of that name known to Sāgaranandin. He fails to note the significant fact that the prologues of both the dramas contain the same elements and are in part similarly worded, which shows that the Svapnavāsavadatta known to Sāgara (*i.e.*,) probably the Bhāsa drama, though the author is not named here opened like ours with the entry of Yaugandharāyaṇa (and probably of Vāsavadattā, for that is given in the original legend of the Bṛhatkathā, as testified by the concurrent versions of the Kathāsaritsāgara and the Bṛhatkathāmañjarī) followed by that of Padmāvatī accompanied by her retinue. Sāgara never once mentions the name of the authors of the works he lays under contribution, so it is no matter for surprise that he does not name Bhāsa. The opponent of the Bhāsa theory can only urge that Sāgara is quoting from a *third* Svapnavāsavadatta, a very unconvincing answer. We think, there is not much doubt that all the various citations in the different dramaturgical treatises, given as from the Svapnavāsavadatta, have been extracted from only one source, Bhāsa's Svapnavāsa-

vadatta, or to be more precise, from one or the other of the different versions or recensions of the play with which the particular rhetorician happened to be familiar.

II

FESTGABE ADOLF KAEGI von Schülern and Freunden dargebracht zum 30 September 1919 (Frauenfeld, 1919).

In this Adolf Kaegi Memorial Volume, published in 1919, the papers of special interest to Indoligists are the following: "Sanskrit and Old Iranian words for good and evil" (Schwyzer); "The Sanskrit mutes called mūrdhanya, that is domal" (Lanman); "Word Haplology in the Rigveda" (Geldner); "Kālidāsa as a euphuistic poet" (Hillebrandt); "Mahosadha and Amarā" (Müller-Hess); "The right of pre-emption in Ancient India" (Jolly); and "Indian theories of dream condition" (Abegg).

SCHWYZER's is a study in Indo-Iranian semantics, following the development in the meanings of words for good and evil, with the thesis that such words, even in their ethical sense, are to be traced back to purely physical or sensuous meanings.

LANMAN pleads ardently for the use of the word "domal" for rendering the Sanskrit mūrdhanya, as applied to the group of consonants commonly known as lingual, cerebral or cacuminal. "The arrangement of the sounds of the Sanskrit alphabet," observes Lanman (p. 95), "is a marvel of scientific insight. The five classes of mutes in particular are arranged in the order of the *places* (sthānāni) in the oral cavity (āsyam) where that contact of the speech-organs is made which gives to each class its main characteristic as a set of sounds. And the order is in absolutely regular sequence from the posterior 'places' to the anterior 'places' of the cavity." After examining the claims of the various words in current use for the Sanskrit mūrdhanya, and rejecting each in turn, Lanman concludes that "the best English equivalent for mūrdhanya, 'produced at the dome (of the palate)', is clearly domal"

The paper of Prof. GELDNER, owing to its importance, deserves a more detailed notice. In this paper Geldner enunciates

a new principle of Ṛgveda interpretation, which he calls Word Haplology. Haplology is the elision of one element out of two consecutive, identical or similar elements. Examples of (syllabic) haplology have already been adduced by Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, part 1, section 279. Wackernagel distinguishes two kinds of haplology: (*a*) medial, *i.e.*, confined to and within one and the same word, and (*b*) final, *i.e.*, at the end of the prior element of a compound. But haplology may extend, argues Geldner, over two different consecutive words. To this latter class, according to Geldner, belong in part the Vedic datives in ā (cited by Pischel, *Ved. Stud.* 1, 77) such as *madā yaḥ* (RV. 8, 49, 3) for *madāya yaḥ*. Likewise we have in *muhu kā cid* (RV. 4, 20, 9) not only the same word but the same word arrangement as that of a previous hymn *kasmiñ cic chūra muhuke janānām* (RV. 4, 16, 17). Geldner therefore feels justified in extending the principle of syllabic superposition to independent words. Whole words may be absorbed when a similar word follows or precedes. Word Haplology is only a particular case of the Ellipse. Geldner proposes to solve the interpretational difficulties of the stanzas cited below, by restoring the words which are needed to complete the sense and construction, and which, according to him, have been haplologically omitted: in RV. 2, 1, 5 *gnā(ḥ) gnāvo* for *gnāvo*; in 3, 36, 7 *samudreṇa na* for *samudreṇa*; in 1, 61, 7 *mahaḥ pituḥ pitum* for *mahaḥ pitum* (cf. 3, 48, 2), in 1, 26, 9 *ubhayeṣām amṛtānām amṛta* for *ubhayeṣām amṛta*; in 6, 24, 9 *taṁ vaḥ sakhāyaṁ sakhāyaḥ* for *taṁ vaḥ sakhāyaḥ*; in 6, 2, 9, *amatreṇa amatriṇ* for *amatrin*; in 10, 8, 9 *satpatiṁ satpatir* for *satpatir*; in 5, 75, 7 *aryo aryayā*; in 4, 8, 8 *sa vipo vipraś* for *sa vipraś* (contra Oldenberg, according to whom *vipaś* should be read for *vipraś* of the text); in 1, 143, 3 *aty aktum aktur* for *aty aktur*; in 5, 1, 8, *sve dame damūnāḥ* for *sve damūnāḥ*; in 10, 7, 1 *yajathāya devān deva* for *yajathāya deva.* Haplological elision of syllables takes place, according to Wackernagel, sometimes notwithstanding the intervention of intermediate dissimilar syllables. Accordingly in 7, 6, 1 Geldner explains *vande dāruṁ* as a haplological contraction of *vande van dārum*, referring to the parallel passage 1,147,2 *vandārus te tanvaṁ vanda agne.*

HILLEBRANDT examines and justifies the claims of Kālidāsa to be called not only a kavi but a mahākavi.

In the paper "Mahosadha and Amarā" MULLER-HESS has dealt with the different versions of a saga of which the central figures are Mahosadha and Amarā. The original form of this saga has probably been preserved in the Pali version of the Saṁyuttanikāya, in which Māra is compared to a vendor of needles. This saga has undergone further development in Sanskrit and Pali works. The Sanskrit version occurs in the Divyāvadāna (p. 521 ff.) and the Pali version in the Sūcijātaka (no. 388, Fausboll's Ed. vol. 3, p. 281 ff.). The introduction to this story is to be found in Mahāummaggajātaka (Fausboll's Ed. vol. 6, pp. 363-6). The most interesting passages in this story are the enigmatical answers of Amarā. Turning to the Sanskrit recensions, the most important of them is the one preserved in the Mahāvastu (ed. Senart, II, pp. 83-7). Müller-Hess seeks to emend the extremely corrupt text of the Mahāvastu with the help of other extant versions of the tale. There are references to this story in Milindapañha, Aśvaghoṣa's Sūtrālaṁkāra, in village folk-tales of Ceylon, and there exist Tibetan and Chinese versions of this fable. On the Bharhut Stūpa (Cunningham, Plate 25, Fig. 3) is depicted a scene in which Amarā brings before the king the four unmasked swindlers who had slandered her husband (Jāt. vol. 6, pp. 369 ff.), the inscription of which reads *Yavamajhakiyaṁ jātakaṁ*.

The chief importance of the paper by JOLLY on the right of pre-emption in Ancient India lies in the digression on the age of the Kauṭilīya Arthaśāstra. While discussing the origin and growth of the idea of this right, Jolly points out that though in its formulation of the conception of property, the K. A., exhibits many an archaic trait, nevertheless there are other and more substantial reasons against its ascription to the time of Cāṇakya and Candragupta Maurya. In this connection Jolly answers two new arguments advanced by R. Mookerji in support of the authenticity of the K. A. Mookerji, firstly, believes that certain passages in the K. A. contain veiled allusions to the Maurya Candragupta. One of these passages is *tena guptaḥ prabhavati*. Jolly rejects the interpretation of Jayaswal and Mookerji. Admitting there is any allu-

sion, it would refer to one of the Gupta kings rather than to the Maurya. But Jolly prefers to interpret it differently. He next controverts Mookerjī's argument based on the points of agreement between the K. A. and Megasthenes by pointing out similar agreements between the K. A. on the one hand, and the itineraries of the Chinese pilgrims Fahian, Yuan Chwang and I-tsing and the diary of the Arab Alberuni on the other. The chronological argument based on the similarities between Megasthenes and the K.A., concludes Jolly, are as inconclusive as the alleged veiled allusions to Candragupta Maurya.

V. S. S.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

1. DIE ZEIT ZOROASTERS. By JOHANNES HERTEL, Leipzig, 1924, pp. 63. [Indo-Iranische Quellen u. Forschungen, Heft I.]
2. ACHAEMENIDEN UND KAYANIDEN. By JOHANNES HERTEL, Leipzig, 1924, pp. 103. [Indo-Iranische Quellen u. Forschungen, Heft V.]

The 'classical' essay on the date of Zoroaster by Jackson (*Zoroaster*, 150 ff.) deserves no better praise than that given to it by Tiele and others. No doubt it is 'impartial and exhaustive,' but what is the value of an argument by enumeration, especially when all concurring statements are derived from one and the same source, *viz.*, the Sasanian tradition? He defends the traditional date by assuring us that the Persians have not committed the mistake of identifying Vishtāspa with Hystaspes and reminds us that their ancestries are so widely different (p. 171). Hertel's researches are not a mere echo of Jackson as will be seen from what follows. They really deserve our serious attention, which is sure to result in great admiration. Our people or at least the scholars should lay aside the sentimental weakness usually shown in matters like this. Besides summarizing Hertel's arguments, I have inserted my additions and corrections. The former would strengthen the point at issue, whereas the latter would save it from mere destructive criticism.

The contents of the first pamphlet have been already made public by me some months ago in the *Journal of the Iranian Association* (October 1924). Hertel shows in the first section how Zarathushtra could not have flourished centuries before Darius by comparing the Gāthās, the Old-Persian Inscriptions, and the account of the Persian religion by Herodotus with one another. Darmesteter has tried to explain some important omissions and differences in Herodotus (vide *SBE.* IV, first edition, Intr. 44 f. and 51 f.). As for the absence of Ahriman in the latter he says that the historian wanted to describe religious customs and not religious conceptions. But Herodotus could have certainly named

Ahriman, if the name were current, when he referred to the practice of the Magians of killing noxious creatures, 'ants and serpents and all that creeps and flies' (1. 140). It should be noted that the last refers to insects, and not to birds which according to the Avesta are not Daeva-ic but Ahura-ic creatures, and that the juxtaposition 'dog and man' in the same place is sure to remind us of the Vendīdād where it is so common. We know that the latter enjoins the duty of destroying the noxious creatures: all such passages are given by Hertel in Appendix 2. I may add that among the implements of the priest the weapon for performing this merit (khraftastraghna) holds the second place (V. 18. 1-4). Another difference is in the name of Persian priests. Herodotus calls them 'Magians' (1.132), which word he elsewhere gives as the name of one of the six Median tribes (1.101); whereas the Avesta knows them as Athravan, which is nothing but their professional name. Darmesteter would explain this thus: the Persian, proud of his race, would call his priest after his origin and not after his profession or functions. The priest, however, would style himself after his profession, especially because his tribal name was a sign of spite and scorn. Herodotus no doubt must have followed the people at large in calling their priests Magians, but why should he not give the other name, if it were current then? I am sure that the word Magian (Moghu) was purposely avoided by the priests from the Avesta even where the Magian influence has worked. There is one crucial passage (Y. 65.7) where it was natural for the priest to be overruled by his feelings, and there he has used the word Moghu. He invoked the Good Waters for not allowing the enemies of the friends (patrons? hashi-tbish), of the priests (moghu-⁰), of the servants (varəzānō-⁰) and of the family-members (nāfyō-⁰) to have the upper hand. This enumeration is quite logical and the meaning correct. Bartholomae unnecessarily repeats himself by translating the passage '... of the members (of the priestly class), of the Magians, of the members of the society and of the family-members ...' As Herodotus does not mention Athravan, we can say that in his days the East-Iranian Athravans had not yet migrated to the west and mixed with the Magians there. After all it has been admitted on all hands that

Herodotus's description of the popular religion in the then Persia (Persis) corresponds exactly to what we meet with in the Young Avesta. The notable difference is that the latter contains at least the lip service as regards the prophet and his God, whereas the former does not even mention them. The people there still worshipped the old Indogermanic god Dyaus (Zeus). Hence Hertel is undoubtedly right when he says that Persia proper was untouched by Zarathushtra's reform in those days. We must further conclude that the religion of the Young Avesta, not only the worship of the nature gods and special gods, but also the religious practices of the Vendīdād must be pre-Zoroastrian. Otherwise how can they be in Persia, and the prophet not, in the days of Herodotus ? This fact will show that one is not right in arguing that a long period is necessary for the development of the religion and its vast literature. It is a sheer mistake to say that the reform-work of the prophet has called forth the Avesta. As a matter of fact Zarathushtra was a voice in the wilderness. The time was not ripe for him and he failed to impress his teachings upon the people. Even the Yasna Haptaṅhaiti breathes quite another spirit. The authors of the Yashts used the great name of the prophet to spread their own religion. In the west they were joined by the Magians, who added their own culture and stamped the whole with the seal of Zarathushtra's name, thus passing it as an authentic document. We need not say that they did this consciously ; they did it out of their incapability for doing something better. It is enough that they have preserved the words of the prophet, which alone depict him in true light.

Returning to our author we see that he now examines the inscriptions of the Achæmenians. Darius is the first of them to invoke Auramazdā. If one argues that Zarathushtra had not invented the name Ahura Mazdāh but had simply borrowed it from his tribe or race, the name was all the same new for Persia, and therefore Darius and his successors must be considered Zoroastrian. It has been argued by Tiele[1] and others that a long period

---

[1] *Vide* G. K. Nariman's translation : "The Religion of the Iranian Peoples," p. 45.

of time must be allowed to account for the difference between the divided form Mazdāh... Ahura (or Ahura... Mazdāh), the fixed one Ahura Mazdāh, and the combined one Auramazdā. This is not necessary. The fixed form we meet with already in the Gathic text Yasna Haptaṅhaiti; and Auramazdā is a loan word in O. Pers. and the change is probably due to the genius of the tongue. Again why should we ignore the two instances, Dar. Pers. e § 3 where Aurā (Instr.) alone is used, and Xerx. Pers. c § 3 where we meet with Aurahya Mazdāha (Gen.) in divided form? I may here note that Hertel (p. 19) is mistaken in concluding from Bis. § 59 that Auramazdā is a recently proclaimed God. Darius wants to say that the former kings did not achieve what he did—by the will of Auramazdā. The context shows that the emphasis is certainly upon what *he* achieved and not *through whom* he did it (cf. Dar. Pers. f § 2). Not only Darius but his successors too praise Auramazdā as the creator, etc., and hence we cannot say that Darius refers to a new religion; nor does the absence of the 'exhortation' in the inscriptions of Xerxes, etc., would point to it. I am not unaware of the fact that the spirit of Zoroaster's teachings is adequately reproduced by Darius, but that alone is not sufficient to prove him a patron of the prophet. If that would have been the case, Darius would have certainly mentioned it in his memoirs on the rocks. I, therefore, cannot agree with Hertel as to what he says with reference to Y. 53. 8-9 (p. 44 ff.). He would connect the danger mentioned there with the Magian revolt. Vishtāspa, he adds, had not the courage to put it down. The words, however, appealed to young Darius, and he went against the usurper. This is not quite easy to believe. Zarathushtra thankfully refers to his chief supporters again and again; not once is to be found even the name of Darius. Again the latter expressly names his helpers and friends. Why should he then be so forgetful and ungrateful as not to refer to the great man who was, so to say, the first cause of his greatness? This omission can only be explained by the hypotheses that Darius cared very little for Zarathushtra, though his words and deeds were full of his spirit, or that Zarathushtra was a figure of the past. The first hypothesis seems to be very probable. We know that Darius was with Cambyses in his Egyptian campaign

(Herodotus 3, 139) as a youth of 22, and after his return he was busy in planning the overthrow of Gaumāṭa. Soon after he came to the throne his time was taken up in subduing one rebellion after the other. Again he was a great warrior and a greater statesman and so very probably not inclined to other things. It is not known that he was a zealous propagandist of his faith; on the contrary we do know that he not only was tolerant towards non-Zoroastrian religions but, he even encouraged them. The close resemblance between Ys. 37. 1, a verse of the Yasna Haptaṅhaiti, and the oft-occurring praise-formula about Auramazdā in the inscriptions makes Darius contemporaneous with the generation following Zarathushtra. The second hypothesis is now out of question, when Hertel has shown that Zarathushtra could not have flourished centuries before Darius and Herodotus, in whose days the people at large still followed the old religion, and only the king and his little circle must have adopted the new one. It seems to me that the addition of the words 'the god of the Aryans,' as an explanation to Auramazdā in the Elamite version of the Bisitum inscription (§§ 62,63. col. 4, l. 77 and l. 79) points to the limited spread of the new religion. Hence our learned author concludes that Vishtāspa of the Gāthās, the patron-prince of the prophet can be no other than Hystaspes of the Greeks, the father of Darius the Great. To show that Hystaspes was not a private person, as Weissbach proclaims him to be (*Keilinschrift der Achaemeniden*, Intr. 70), Hertel refers to Herodotus 3. 70, where Hystaspes is called a satrap. If this be not enough, I would point to the beginning (§ 4) of both the Bisitum Inscriptions. Darius says there. "8 of my family (there were) who were formerly kings. I am the ninth. 9 we are kings in two lines (duvitāparnam)". Further we know from the 'Cylinder' Inscription of Cyrus the Great that the latter reckons his three ancestors—upto Teispes—and calls them Great Kings. Thus the senior line consisted of five kings. Now if we add to these Ariaramnes, the younger son of Teispes, and his descendants upto Darius, then alone can Darius be the ninth. It is true that he calls his father only Hystaspes, not King Hystaspes, but we must not forget that Teispes too is not called King although Cyrus calls him Great King. Artaxeres II

gives his ancestry upto Hystaspes calling all but the latter King (Susa a). Artaxerxes III too gives his ancestry upto Arsames, calling all but Hystaspes and Arsames Kings (Pers. § 2). This only shows that Darius and his descendants used the word King in a limited sense, and Vishtāspa was not a king in the sense in which the former were. King he was still as we showed above.

Unfortunately Vishtāspa has different epithets in different sources. In the cuneiform inscriptions he is known as an Achæmenian, whereas in the Gāthās he is styled Kavi, which word has been taken as a dynastic name. Thus the scholars wisely thought to keep these two names poles apart. Now in the second section of his excellent monograph the learned author examines the claims of this so called Kavi dynasty of Iran. The word Kavi is used in the Gāthās as an epithet of certain persons, named and unnamed; one friendly, others inimical, to Zarathushtra. It has been admitted on all hands that the word, when not applied to Vishtāspa, means 'a chief,' 'a prince'; but why this exception? It fits excellently well in the case of Vishtāspa too. And so has Geldner translated the word. Hertel has shown in his *Achaemeniden und Kayaniden* that even in the Young Avesta the word does not point to any dynastic name, but it has the simple sense of 'prince' or 'princely.' Even so in Pahlavi where Siyāvakhsh is not called 'kay' (king), because he never came to the throne; he is called Kavi in Yt. 13,132 and 19.71—both non-metrical passages; but this is due to mere analogy of recital.

In the third section the author examines the arguments put forward by the champions of the higher date for Zarathushtra. He rightly discards the theory of E. Meyer, based upon the names Mazdaku and Maztaku in the list of Sargon (722–705). We can say the same thing re. Tiele's theory based upon the names like Phraortes.[1] As regards the argument from the political and ecomonical conditions as found in the Avesta, it is enough to point to what a Chinese traveller of 128 B. C. says about Chorasan and Bactria, of his days (Moulton, *Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 85). Hertel thinks of the development theory almost as I have touched

[1] *Vide* G. K. Nariman's translation : "The Religion of the Iranian Peoples," p. 45.

upon a little before. The second Appendix has been referred to. The others are on the dog-mania, on the disposal of the dead through vultures, on the atrocity referred to in the Gāthās, and on the Yasna Haptaṅhaiti.

* * *

The booklet *Achaemeniden und Kayaniden* adds to or rather improves our knowledge of ancient Iranian history. In the first section the learned author gives the sources of the Kayanian geneological tree, and examines their worth. One of them, Bundahishn 34, not only enumerates the names of the early kings, but also gives the number of years each of them reigned for. Some historical kings are allotted extraordinarily long reigns, whereas the others are omitted. The Parthian rule has been cut down almost by half, whereas the Sasanian one has been prolongated by a number of years. But still we can gather something out of this chaos. The extraordinarily long reign--120 years--of Vishtāspa should be understood as covering the reigns of Cyrus and his successors upto Xerxes. Vahuman has been identified with Artaxerxes in Vahuman Yasht 2.17 (Artakhshahr i kay ke [ms. ka] Vahumani Spendādhān khvānīhedh) and in Great Bundahishn f. 118 a l. 11 (Artakhshahr ke Vahumani Spendādhān guft). Albiruni does the same, and along with Firdausi gives him his epithet 'Long-handed.' He has been also allotted a great span of reign, 112 years; very probably because of the three kings bearing the same name. The Vah. Yt. (2.17) adds that he spread the religion in the whole world. The two Daras are also mentioned, the second having been credited for the collection of religious scriptures. The learned author rightly opines that these notices are neither borrowed from the Greek sources, nor are they fabricated. In other words, no dynasty comes to an end with Vishtāspa, but it is continued by those kings who are known as Achæmenians in history. On the other hand, the religious character of these accounts is too clear to make one believe that they offer us a political history. They only provide us a sort of church-history, which is again neither exact nor complete. As regards the omission of Darius and Xerxes, Hertel firmly believes that the strong opposition of the former against the Magians is its cause. But what about Xerxes? He is not known to have done

anything which would have brought him in disfavour of the Magians. On the contrary, if we can trust Herodotus (7.43,113,191), they were his constant companions, performing all sorts of ceremonies for him and his enterprises. We must explain the anomaly in some other way.

The second section deals with the legions of brothers and sons of Vishtāspa, and the third with his ancestors. I doubt whether anybody took seriously the attempt of Justi to construct the geneological tree of Vishtāspa's family; and if any one did, he can hardly continue his belief after Hertel's crushing criticism of it. The same can be said of Vishtāspa's forefathers, the so-called Kavis. Some of these have been mentioned in Yt. 13. Its list, which is certainly genuine, contains the names of the first faithful in the order of their conversion to the faith. A glance at it will show how Maidyōiānha immediately follows Zarathushtra and how some known and unknown persons precede Vishtāspa, how naturally appear some foreigners later on. It is after Saoshyant, that there follows a section containing Yima, Thraetaona, etc., Kavis or kings—even Darmesteter translates the word thus here—and heroes. Their separation and especially their occurrence after Saoshyant is very peculiar; and we may naturally doubt their right of being originally in the Yasht. Some of them are considered as astronomical myths. All the same, one thing is certain that there is no trace nor suggestion that they are related to one another, much less with Vishtāspa who occurs quite in another place. Why should we make them follow one after the other? They may as well be contemporary petty princes of various parts of Iran. Zarathushtra refers to Yima (Y. 32, 8) as if he were his contemporary like Grehma (32, 12). Thus we may say that the princes, etc., of this list must have adopted the religion later on, and hence their names here like those of the other people. Hertel rightly asks why Vishtāspa's father and grandfather are not mentioned here, if the author of the Yasht meant to give his geneology. He then examines Yt. 19 and shows how there too the word Kavi can mean one and one thing only: king or kingly. Vishtāspa is also separated from the other 'kings' by Zarathushtra being placed between him and them and his immediate forefathers are again

altogether left out. In Yt. 5.105—and there only—Vishtāspa is called the son of Aurvat-aspa. This Yasht belongs no doubt to the earlier and metrical group, but its relative late origin can be judged from its foreign goddess Anāhitā and from its geographical data; not only eastern provinces are mentioned but also western ones including Babylon. Therefore this solitary reference to Vishtāspa's father need not be taken with absolute certainty. The ground on which Hertel assigns it a late date (p. 68), *viz.*, the fact that Ahura Mazdāh is made to worship Arədvi, is not sound, because all the Yashts have this as their common feature.

Some words accounting for the silence of the Avesta about Darius and Xerxes will not be out of place. They have no place in Yt. 13, because the large majority of unknown names mentioned therein points to some corner of East Iran as its home. Although I do not agree with those who argue for the higher antiquity of a text, because Persia and Media are omitted in it, I would use the geographical data to prove at least its home. It is quite probable, nay quite natural, that there is only a local colouring in various pieces of the Avesta. Also Yt. 19, or to be more exact, the Khvarənah account, points only to the east, and hence it too has only local meaning. Some of the Yashts (*e. g.* 5) refer to the west, especially the north-west as well, and the Vendīdād shows clear influence of the Magians. In these texts either there arose no occasion to mention the great kings, or they were the figures of the past for the new-comers from the east. The Magians had evidently no reason to receive them. Again it appears to me that the quarrels between Darius and the Magians were political rather than religious and the hatred against them was due to racial and class difference (cf. Herodotus 1.120; 3.73, 126).

In the fourth section Hertel discusses the theories of G. Hüsing who tries to identify the Avestic Aurvat-aspa with Justin's (1.9) Oropastes, a brother of Gaumāta, and who sees in Spəntōdāta, the first or private name of Darius. As neither the Iranian tradition nor the Greek sources mention this fact, which both of them have done in the case of Artaxerxes III, Hertel would not accept it. On the contrary, Herodotus calls Darius and Xerxes with these very names, even when he speaks of them as not reigning kings. Again

Spəntōdāta never came to the throne. With good grounds (66-67) Hertel rejects the identification of Aurvat-aspa and Oropastes.

The sixth and last section dealing with Hutaosā and Naotara is very important inasmuch as it supplies the evidence for identifying Vishtāspa of the Gāthās with the father of Darius. The literal meaning of the word Naotara is 'younger'; and Hertel agrees with those few scholars who take it for Ariaramnes, the younger son of Teispes, and not for the fabricated Notar, the son of Manushchihr of Bundahishn 31. Naotara became an epithet of Ariaramnes's descendants, *e.g.*, Vishtāspa (Yt. 5.98) and Vishtauru (Yt. 5.76; 13, 102). In Yt. 17.55-56 Ashi complains that the Turas and the Naotaras scared her away. The learned author takes this unfavourable reference to the Naotaras as a direct hint against Darius because of his severe treatment of the Magians. I am not prepared to agree with him, as I do not share his views on the latter point. I am tempted to suggest that the poet perhaps breathes here the tone of a pacifist, denouncing the fighting parties, irrespective of nation and religion. As for Hutaosā, scholars have concluded from Yt. 15.35–36 that she belonged to the Naotara family. There we are told that she offers up a sacrifice in the family or district (vīsa) of Naotara to the Wind praying that she may be dear, loved, and well-received in the house (nmāna) of Vishtāspa. Hertel asks why should we not understand from this passage that Hutaosā sacrifices not in her father's house but in that of her husband and that she marries not Vishtāspa himself but one of his sons? If we put aside the modern conceptions of marriage and love, then we know that only in her husband's house Hutaosā's prayer has sense. According to Herodotus she was the wife of Darius. Hence we must say that either Vishtāspa's wife had the same name or there is a confusion here. Such confusions are not seldom; *e. g.*, Lōhrāsp has been attributed to the destruction of Jerusalem and dispersion of the Jews (Mkh. 27.67; Anklesarias' ed. 26. 66a). A somewhat similar account is to be found in the Dīnkard (West, 51.4–5; Madan's ed., p. 433 1.7 ff), according to which he goes to Jerusalem with Nebuchadnezzar (Bōkht Narseh) and abolishes the improper law and wicked practices and Dev-worship there. Here we have a remi-

niscence of the deeds of Cyrus, which however are made quite contrary by the orthodox fanaticism.

The Appendices will be shortly dismissed off. Hertel does not agree with Hüsing in his attempt at identifying Artabanos and Artaphernes—sons of Hystaspes, with Ātərəvanu and Ātərəkhvarənah (Yt. 8.102).—In the second Appendix Hertel cites examples in which sātar, sāstar have double meaning of a good and a bad king. As a matter of fact the word means king as such. It is not necessary that a good king and a bad king must have special words to denote them.—The third contains a discussion on the remaining passages containing the word Kavi. Hertel rightly discards the identification of Pourushti (Yt. 13.114) with Parysatis, suggested by Hüsing; nor does he agree with the latter in his supposition that in Yt. 13, 119 Kuroush (Karoish), son of Parysatis, must have been dropped before Kavōish.—The fourth contains the criticism of the theory of W. Schulz, who would bring the flight of Ashi (Yt. 17) in correspondence with that of Dike in Phainomena of Aratos (101-134). Then we find four tables containing genealogical trees of Iranian kings from different sources.

I cannot close the review before expressing my firm belief that Hertel has done a unique service to the cause of Iranian studies by critically examining the problem of the date of Zarathushtra; and I am sure that every unprejudiced scholar will accept the chief results of his investigations even while differing from him as regards details. I hope that my review will be of some use to that effect.

HAMBURG UNIVERSITY, *May* 1925. } J. C. TAVADIA.

THE BHAGAVADGITA OR THE SONG OF THE BLESSED ONE. Interpreted by FRANKLIN EDGERTON. The Open Court Publishing Company, U.S.A., 1925.

The survival of all works of Art, especially of the art literary, is determined by its peculiar, indefinable and intrinsic or immanent value, which cannot be directly subjected to any canons of social, political, moral, logical or religious thought. Art reaches out beyond all criticism, favourable or otherwise, and tacitly forbids

every form of objective treatment of itself. Hence the seductive fascination it exercises upon those who come under its influence, and through it, impels them, in spite of the prohibition, to an objective—so called logical—handling of it.

The Bhagavadgītā is one of such seductive works of Art, and has called forth a number of translations, scholarly and otherwise, and a variety of interpretations, more or less arbitrary and tending towards polemics. Most of these are known to oriental and occidental scholars, but the one not yet known, being a very recent production by Prof. Franklin Edgerton, is the occasion for its introduction to the readers of this *Journal.*

Among the many motives that determined Prof. Edgerton to undertake an interpretation of the Bhagavadgītā, the " popularity " of the Gītā and the " interest and importance " the Gītā derives from the " Gandhi Movement " seem to have exerted a preponderating influence upon his mind. And here Prof. Edgerton needs to be informed, if not corrected, that the "Gandhi Movement " is not a religious but a political movement and that even as such it is not so " popular " as it is imagined to be. Moreover it may be safely asserted that the " popularity " of the Gītā is something which works against and not for the Gītā. The Gītā was never meant by its author to be made " popular ," that is to say, it was never intended for all and sundry, but for only a few endowed with specific qualities ; it was an Upaniṣad. A reference to Gītā, Chapter 18, Verse 67, and Chapter 3, Verses 26, 29, will be found sufficiently convincing of the intention of the author of the Gītā, and a further reference to Chapter 7, Verse 19, will not fail to bring home the fact how difficult, if not altogether impossible, it is for ordinary intelligence to realize the meaning of the Gītā. It is a common error to confound " popularity " with familiarity, which is a subjective, realization and a rare occurrence.

The other, and a very pertinent, motive underlying the work of Prof. Edgerton is his sincere desire to arrange more systematically the materials which he believes lie " helter-skelter " in the Gītā. By a rearrangement of these scattered materials the author hopes to make his book a more satisfactory introduction to the Gītā

than the original work or any translation. That he has accomplished the task thoroughly and well will be obvious to any reader of his work. On the other hand the frank confession that the book is intended for the general public rather than for the specialist disarms all criticism of Prof. Edgerton's interpretation, which as far as it goes sets forth in full relief and thereby simplifies but does not solve the problems raised in the work interpreted by him.

Unlike Garbe, Hopkins, von Humboldt and others, who lay unusual stress upon the interpolations and dispute the homogeneous character of the Gītā, Prof. Edgerton recognizes the unity of the Gītā, also perceives its psychological character but fails to see behind "two opposing views" the truth embodied in the elusive form of subtle paradoxes. The paradoxical character of the Gītā has been the despair of commentators at all times and has often led them to introduce meanings which they could not deduce from the body of the work itself.

Prof. Edgerton's undisguised disappointment with the morality of the Gītā may be said to be due to his failure to reconcile himself with the epistemological and the psychological stand-point expressed abundantly in the Gītā. An accurate understanding of Verse 27 of Chapter 3, and Verse 17 of Chapter 18 will serve to show that the morality of the Gītā is, as Nietzsche, one of Germany's leading philosophical psychologists, who was also a philologist, has so beautifully expressed it, "beyond Good and Evil"; it is amoral, even as all genuine Art is amoral.

The problem of Evil, its origin and its place and function in the scheme of the Universe has exercised the mind of philosophers from time immemorial and one may accept "philosophically" with Arjuna the solution offered in the Gītā as final. But Prof. Edgerton writes on page 62 of his book, "no real answer is given" and then adds significantly, "perhaps because none can be given". Without further comment it may be stated that Prof. Edgerton himself has not supplied his readers with a "real answer".

We welcome the work of Prof. Edgerton and feel no hesitation in recommending it to our readers for its scholarly attainments, methodology and some fresh and valuable suggestions.

D. P. THAKORE.

THE ECONOMIC HISTORY OF ANCIENT INDIA BY SANTOSH KUMAR DAS, M.A.—Published by the Author.

This work embodies with certain alterations and additions the lectures that the author delivered in 1922-23 at the Kālikātā Vidyāpīṭh, an institution which exists no more. The author's aim "is to present the facts in a connected manner with a view to illustrate, as far as possible, the gradual development of the economic conditions from the earliest times." After a brief reference to the Palaeolithic, the Neolithic and the Copper ages, the author passes successively in review the economic conditions in the Ṛgvedic age, in the Brāhmaṇa period, in the age of the Buddha and in the times of the Mauryas, the Kushans, the Guptas and Harṣa.

The work shows considerable industry and research. The author, however, appears not to have explored his sources for himself ; he takes many things on trust. One should like to know on what data in the Ṛgveda or the other Vedas the author bases his conclusions expressed on page 10 in the words " the following were excluded from inheritance : eunuchs, outcastes, born deaf or dumb or blind, idiots ". On page 105 the author appears to confound the Vārtikakāra Kātyāyana with Kātyāyana the Jurist, who flourished about a thousand years later. The usefulness of the work is somewhat marred by the fact that the author employs the Bengali script for all quotations from Sanskrit. There are numerous misprints, some of which such as 'Rāmapāda' for Romapāda (page 52), 'Parāśara' for Pāraśava (page 88), 'Mahābhāgga' for Mahāvagga (page 104) are distinctly disconcerting. The author's substitution of *b* for *v* in even well-known names like those of Yājñavalkya, Pancaviṁśa, Mahāvaṁśa jars on the ear.

In spite of these drawbacks the work is a very useful compilation and presents in a compact form valuable information on the economic condition of India from the earliest times to the 7th century A. D.

P. V. KANE.

IN MEMORIAM.

Dr. Sir Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar.

Dr. Bhandarkar's fame as a writer on questions of Indian philology, history and archæology does perhaps not rest mainly, certainly not solely, on contributions to this Journal. Yet it seems that this periodical can claim the distinction that its pages contain the earliest attempts at research by Bhandarkar.[1] The Journal of the B.B.R.A.S. being then, as it were, something of a literary birth-place of this great scholar and research worker, it is fit that a memorial tablet should be put up here to sum up and preserve the remembrance of one of the most renowned members the Society ever has had the good fortune to have on its rolls.

The contributions from Dr. Bhandarkar are spread over vols. x-xxv, the first paper being published 13 April, 1871, the last in 1918. The first paper, "Transcript and Translation of a Copper plate grant of the fifth century of the Christian era, found in Gujarat with remarks" (x. p. 19), was published by the writer in the 34th year of his

[1] The first literary production of Bhandarkar seems to have been a review of Haug's Aitareya Brāhmaṇa, published in *Native Opinion*, 28th February and 6th March 1864. Weber noticed the review and discovered its promising writer. The professor of Berlin University, then at his height, wrote 1865 of this review:— "It is, so far as I know, the first time that a Hindu has subjected the work of a European Sanskrit scholar, with courage and self-confidence, to a searching criticism and, indeed, even in such a manner as establishes his qualification and equipment for the task". Even this was not so great a compliment paid to Bhandarkar as when Weber inserted the same review in his *Indische Studien* Vol. IX, pp. 177ff. Cp. *Progress of Education*, II (1925), pp. 27f.

age, the last paper given to the Journal, " The Aryans in the Land of the Assurs (Skr. Asura)" (xxv. p. 76), was brought out when he was over fourscore. This proves, among other things, the faithfulness of Sir Ramkrishna to our Journal and Society. The contributions number 18 in all and their titles indicate the topics with which this pioneer of modern learning was busy all his lifetime. Seven papers belong to archæology, six of them are on epigraphical matters in particular, five on philological problems, two on literary history, two on history, one on an ethnographical-historical question, and one may be called a contribution to the history of learning.

The epigraphical papers either deal with original finds and give independent interpretations, or are criticisms and revisions of former attempts at deciphering them. The two papers on literary history single out a couple of important problems: the date of the Mahābhārata and the date of Patañjali. Bhandarkar did not lose himself in trifles, nor waste his time on trivialities: research was his element, and a push into the unknown his sport. It would be hazardous to assign Bhandarkar a position in the history of learning mainly on the strength of the philological papers in the stricter sense, but those written by him on Sanskrit, the Prakrits and the Vernaculars, are generally acknowledged to be fundamental. A model of method, they have brought such a wealth of material to light that they make Dr. Bhandarkar one of the founders of Indian Vernacular philology. The paper, "My Visit to the Vienna Congress" is a worthy account

Dr. Bhandarkar gave of himself and the new Oriental learning which he represented. At Vienna he, as the head of the rising generation of scholars of this country, handed in the visiting card to the veterans of the West. And it was well received.

The titles of all these papers, but more the papers themselves, betray the earnest scholar and student. Bhandarkar never took up his pen unless he had to say something worth hearing and having, be it knowledge of a new topic or new knowledge of an old problem. He made sure of his facts, examining them microscopically, marshalled them into premises, drew his consequences with the rigidity of the strictest syllogism, for he handled the Nyāya syllogism with the same dexterity as the Aristotelean. Over and above that, he brought the approved Western philological and historical methods to bear on his working. Such a severe discipline saved him from puerilities in philology, comparative philology in particular, and in history. Nor was Dr. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar too wise to learn up to the end of his life; the last contribution to this Journal is proof of that. The universally high reputation as a scholar and writer, which Bhandarkar enjoyed, had been earned by honest, hard labour, and it remains the pride of this Journal that the first documents that helped to build up this reputation are to be found in its own volumes.

As a member of the Managing Committee of the B.B.R.A.S. Bhandarkar lent a hand in directing the affairs of this body. He was at that time first a fully occupied High School teacher, afterwards a busy College professor. In addition he had his

head full of plans for social and religious reform, and his hands were never idle in carrying them out. Still, knowing the importance of the Society for the promotion and spread of Oriental learning, he took his full share in the administration. And as a simple scholar, neither yet Sir nor Doctor h.c., he exercised a far-reaching influence by his painstaking work and commanding learning. Thus directly and indirectly Bhandarkar was instrumental in creating an enviable reputation as a learned body for the Society. It should not be omitted that he was a member for more than 60 years, for he joined young and lived long. Probably no other member can claim such a long and uninterrupted tenure of membership. None certainly may claim to have rendered greater service to the Society than Dr. Sir Ramkrishna Gopal Bhandarkar has given. He is a convincing example that neither a fine building, nor a good library, nor even an able government, by themselves are the causes for the prosperity of a learned society, but the active share which the members take in the literary and scientific life. To help to realise the ideals for which the R.A.S. has been founded was Dr. Bhandarkar's aim, and the services rendered in the attainment of this goal by his great talent and relentless energy are best judged by the extraordinary results achieved. The B.B.R.A.S. rightly sees in Dr. Bhandarkar one of its greatest members and to call him a second founder would be mere justice. Bhandarkar was no less a leader in the renaissance of Sanskrit studies in this country than a herald of the new Oriental learning both to East and West.

R. Z.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

Royal Asiatic Society

Annual Report for 1924

The increase of admissions to membership from 92 to 102 illustrates sufficiently the general healthy condition of the Society and the enduring attractions of its library, also the increasing difficulty of maintaining a reasonable supply and circulation of books and journals.

Several matters reported upon in the previous year have made substantial progress. The design for the Society's Silver Medal is now in its final stages of preparation, after much deliberation, and should be completed during the current year. The Society is greatly indebted to Principal Gladstone Solomon for the expert guidance he has given and for his patience in perfecting its form.

The first elections to the new dignity of Fellow of the Society instituted last year have yielded seventeen names famous in Oriental research or valued by the Society for their association with its interests. The List is given on another page of the report.

The Manuscripts Catalogue progresses slowly but surely, the first 15 forms out of a probable total of 100 being now in print.

The Dewey classification card catalogue of the Society's library according to subjects has covered European Literatures, Biography, History, Travels and Miscellaneous and the first cabinet containing about 12,000 cards is now ready for use. It is hoped that this method of reference may make subject-reference and reading an easier matter than heretofore.

The editorship of the Society's Journal has passed from the nominal control of the Hon. Secretary into the hands of expert Oriental scholars who are members of the Society. A new press for the Journal and new rules for its direction have been decided upon with much thought so as to bring the

publication into line with the best of its kind in Europe or America. The first number of the series, under the able editorship of Dr. V. S. SUKTHANKAR, will be published in April.

The classification of the Society's numismatic collection is complete and awaits revision before publication.

The Provident Fund Scheme for the Society's employees was adopted by the General Body and has worked successfully during the year. There remains the question of the consideration of services rendered by the staff previous to the initiation of the scheme.

In consequence of receipt of another instalment of the Government grant for shelving there has been great activity in the accommodation side of the library. Complete cases of books have been rearranged in the main room; transfer of periodical literature from the gallery to the ground floor file room has provided much additional storage space for books in constant use. In the file room much additional staging has been erected to carry periodicals for reference. Finally, the valuable books have been transferred to the locked gallery room above the Librarian's office where they are under constant surveillance.

The Society, being dissatisfied with Messrs. Kegan Paul's custody of its London agency, has transferred that and its stock to Messrs. Probsthain & Co.

The new edition of *Folklore of Bombay* prepared by Mr. R. E. ENTHOVEN with the help of grants from the Society is now published, and the Society has received its 25 copies, of which it is selling 18 to members at reduced price, presenting one each to five institutions and reserving two for its library.

On the 10th June 1924 the Society's Campbell Memorial Gold Medal was presented in London at a meeting of the Royal Asiatic Society to Sir GEORGE GRIERSON.

There is a proposal to honour another great scholar formerly connected with the Society, Dr. BHAU DAJI, by the presentation of an oil painting of him to the Society.

Later in the year, the Bombay University Reform Committee's questionnaire was received, and a reply returned recommending certain practical steps towards co-operation in book and manuscript purchase and in the encouragement of research. Seeing that the finances of a library are never equal to the purchase of all the books it requires, nor even half of them, this may be considered the most important step taken during the year. By means of some agreement with the University and other learned bodies in Bombay and Poona, and also by a determined effort, which is being planned, to get a much increased monthly grant from Government, it is hoped that the enlargement of the Society's library—its main care—will be both economically and effectively pursued.

Membership

RESIDENT.

On the roll on 1-1-24.	New admissions.	Non-Res. become Resident.	Resigned or ceased to be Members.	Transferred to the Non-Res. list.	Died.	Number of Members on 1-1-25.
539	93	5	86	10	5	536

NON-RESIDENT.

On the roll on 1-1-24.	New admissions.	Resident become Non-Res.	Resigned or ceased to be Members.	Transferred to the Res. list.	Died.	Number of Members on 1-1-25.
168	9	10	16	5	1	165

Of the 536 Resident Members 41 are Life-Members, and 81 are on the Absent list ; and of the 168 Non-Resident Members, 12 are Life-Members and 6 are absent from India.

Obituary

The Committee regret to record the death of the following Members :—

Mr. W. P. Cowie, I.C.S.	Mr. P. P. Meherji.
Sir Currimbhoy Ibrahim.	,, J. S. Sanzgiri.
Mr. H. F. Lodge.	,, H. P. Thackersey.

Papers read, and lectures delivered, before the Society

7th January 1924—A lecture, illustrated with lantern slides, on "The Origin of Alphabets and Numerals." By Dr. R. N. SAHA.

22nd January 1924—" Buddhism in Nagananda." By Prof. N. K. BHAGWAT, M.A.

11th March 1924—" The Eighteen remarkable things or events of the reign of Khusru Parviz (Chosroes II) of Persia." By Shams-ul-ulma Dr. J. J. MODI, B.A., PH.D., C.I.E.

4th July 1924—A lecture on "The New World of Islam." By the Rev. Dr. S. M. ZWEMER.

29th July 1924—" A few notes on Anquetil du Perron's own copy of his Zend-Avesta, Ouvrage de Zoroastre, recently discovered in Colombo." By Dr. J. J. MODI, B.A., PH.D., C.I.E.

11th September 1924—" A Christian Cross with a Pahlavi Inscription recently discovered in the State of Travancore." By Dr. J. J. MODI, B.A., PH.D., C.I.E.

16th September 1924—" Buddhism and Sankaracarya." By K. M. SHEMBAVNEKAR, M.A.

Library

The total number of volumes added was 1,849, of which 1,433 were purchased and 416 were presented.

Books presented to the Society were received, as usual, from the Government of India, the Government of Bombay and other Provincial Governments, as well as from the Trustees of the Parsi Punchayet Funds, other public bodies and individual donors.

A meeting of the Society under Art. XXI of the Rules was held on the 19th of November for the purpose of revising the list of the papers and periodicals received by the Society, and it was decided to omit the following from 1925 :—

(1) *Annals and Magazine of Natural History*, (2) *Journal of Hygiene*, (3) *Journal of the Linnaean Society*, (4) *Slavonic Review*, (5) *Munsey's Magazine*, (6) *Transactions, American Philological Association*, (7) *Advocate of India*, (8) *Bengalee*, and (9) *Commerce*,

and to take the following periodically as under :—

(1) *Navy List* (every 3rd year), (2) *Medical Directory*, (every 3rd year), (3) *Who's Who* (every 3rd year), and (4) *Dod's Peerage* (every 5th year).

It was resolved to subscribe to the following from 1925 :—

(1) *Revue des Arts Asiatiques*, (2) *Asia Major*, (3) *Sociological Review*, (4) *Acta Orientalia*, (5) *Islamica*, (6) *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik*, (7) *British Journal and Photographic Annual*, (8) *Forward*, (9) *Indian Daily Mail*, (10) *Curren Thought*, (11) *Welfare*, and (12) *Visvabharati*.

The Journal Number

No. 75, the second number of Vol. XXVI, was published during the year under report. In addition to an abstract of proceedings of the Society and a list of presents to its Library, it contains the following papers :—

1. The Ancient Indian Symbol for the foreign Sound Z. By Prof. N. B. Divatia, B.A.
2. Two Arabic Medicine-cups. By Ch. Mahomed Ismail, M.A., H.P., M.R.A.S.
3. Sidelights on the past History of the Parsis. By Rao Bahadur P. B. Joshi, PH., D., F.R.G.S.
4. Garcia d'Orta, a little-known Owner of Bombay. By Prof. A. X. Soares, M.A.
5. Studies in Bhasa (V). By Dr. V. S. Sukthankar.
6. Two sets of Chalukya Copper Plates from Navasari. By G. V. Acharya, B.A.
7. A visit to the Great Wall of China. A similar wall of Noshirwan (Chosroes I) of Persia. By Jivanji Jamshedji Modi, B.A., PH.D., C.I.E.
8. An Address by Prof. M. Winternitz, at the meeting of the R. A. S., Bombay Branch, on October 11th, 1923.

Coin Cabinet

52 new coins were added to the cabinet of the Society as under :—

Early South India.

Gold

4 South India Fanam.

1 Coin of Harihara of Vijayanagar.

Madras Government.

Mughal Emperors of India.

Gold

1 Ahmadshah Fanam.

1 Alamgir Fanam.

1 Gaur Shah Fanam.

Madras Government.

Silver		Mint.		Reg.
1	Akbar	Ahmedabad		4*
1	Jahangir	Qandahar	1028	14
1	Do.	,, ...	1030	16
1	Do.	,, ...		
1	Do.	Tatta.		
1	Shahjahan	Barhanpur.		
1	Do.	Gulkonda.		
		C. P. Government.		
				Reg.
1	Do.	Multan	1045	8
1	Do.	,, ...	1048	11
1	Do.	Surat.		
		Punjab Government.		
1	Do.	Surat.	?	
1	Do.	?		Reg.
1	Aurangzeb	Etawa	11*	39
1	Do.	,, ...	1113	45
1	Do.	,, ...	1114	47
1	Do.	Surat	1077	9
1	Do.	,, ...	1091	24
2	Do.	,, ...	1092	25
2	Do.	,, ...	1095	27
1	Do.	,, ...	1096	28
1	Do.	,, ...	1097	29
1	Do.	,, ...	1101	33
1	Do.	,, ...	1102	34
2	Do.	,, ...	1103	35
1	Do.	,, ...	1106	39
1	Do.	,, ...	1111	44(?)
1	Do.	,, ...	1115	47
1	Farruksiyar	Sahajahanabad ..		2
1	Muhammad Shah ..	,, ..	114*	13
1	Do. ..	Surat ..		6
1	Shah Alam			

---

2 Gadhia

3 Punch-marked

2 Of Mahmud III of Gujrat Sultanat

C. P. Government.

1 Arcot Rupee

1 French East India Company

BAHAMANIS OF KULBARGA.

Copper

1 Kalam Ullah — *Madras Government.*

Treasure Trove Coins

There were 701 coins at the close of 1923, and 2,151 were received during the year, besides 4 pieces and two cowries.

The details of the new arrivals are :—

1	Gold	from the Mamlatdar of Chopda.
144	Silver	
20	Silver	from the District Magistrate, West Khandesh.
1,828	Copper	from the District Magistrate, Satara.
4	Gold	from the Mamlatdar of Bassein.
154	Silver	from the Mamlatdar of Raver.

There are thus 2,852 coins with the Society awaiting examination and distribution.

Accounts

A statement of accounts for 1924 is subjoined. The total amount of entrance fees was Rs. 2,000 and subscriptions Rs. 29,918 against Rs. 1,785 and Rs. 30,532 the previous year. The balance to the Society's credit, at the Bank and the cash in hand, was Rs. 9,547-10-6 on 31st December last.

The Government securities held by the Society, including those of the Premchand Roychand Fund and of the Catalogue Fund, are of the face value of Rs. 42,100.

There has been a slight reduction in the price of books due to exchange, and it seems that present levels are likely to be maintained. The general working expenses of the Society are out of proportion to the Revenue, but it is impossible to reduce these without considerably curtailing the Society's activities. We could, however, carry a considerable number of additional members without materially increasing our working expenses, and it is trusted members will keep this in mind and endeavour to increase the membership.

Books were purchased of the value of Rs. 8,323-8-3 against Rs. 8,904-6-5 in the previous year, and periodicals Rs. 3,292-13-3 against Rs. 3,553-0-6

Government was pleased to sanction Rs. 5,000 for shelving in 1924.

The Provident Fund was started from 1st January 1924 and the Society's contribution for the year was Rs. 1,211-10-8.

STATEMENT

The Bombay Branch of

Statement of Receipts and Disbursements

INCOME.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
Balance on 31st December 1923				5,965	2	1
Subscription of Resident Members ..	25,920	8	0			
,, of Non-Resident Members ..	3,997	8	0			
Government Contribution	3,850	0	0			
Sale Proceeds of Journal Numbers ..	635	4	3			
,, of Annual Catalogues ..	57	10	6			
,, of Waste paper	26	8	0			
Interest on Govt. Securities and Savings Bank	2,607	1	3			
Entrance Fee	2,000	0	0			
				39,094	8	0
Government Grant for Shelving	5,000	0	0			
Subscription of Resident Life Members ..	500	0	0			
General Catalogue—Sale and Interest ..	406	12	0			
Replacement	201	0	0			
Folklore Notes, New Edition	10	0	0			
				6,117	12	0
Total Rs.				51,177	6	1

We have examined the account books and vouchers, and have obtained satisfactory information and explanation on all points desired. In our opinion, the accounts as drawn up show the true and correct state of the affairs of the Society.

KENNETH MACIVER,

A. B. AGASKAR,

Hon. Auditors.

the Royal Asiatic Society

Account for the Year 1924

EXPENDITURE.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
Books	8,323	8	3			
Subscription to Indian Newspapers ..	658	13	0			
,, to Foreign ,, ...	2,634	0	3			
Binding and Book-repairs	1,752	0	0			
Printing	1,887	0	0			
Stationery	580	4	0			
Printing Journal Numbers	2,509	8	0			
Office Establishment	15,743	2	6			
General Charges	1,072	4	0			
Postage	425	15	6			
Provident Fund	1,211	10	8			
Insurance	523	12	0			
Electric Charges	522	3	11			
Annual Library Checking	500	0	0			
				38,344	2	1
Gratuity	250	0	0			
Honorarium to Mr. V. B. Ketkar	300	0	0			
Temporary Establishment for Card Catalogue	578	5	6			
Government Securities	1,407	8	0			
Folklore Notes, New Edition	750	0	0			
				3,285	13	6
Balance (including Rs. 549-15-3 of the General Catalogue Fund)	....					
Imperial Bank of India—Current Account.	415	9	1			
,, Saving Bank ..	9,071	14	7			
Amount in Hand	59	14	10			
				9,547	6	6
Total Rs.				51,177	6	1

Invested Funds of the Society.

			Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
Government Securities ..	@ 6	p.c. ..	1,100	0	0			
Do. do. ..	,, 5	p.c. ..	8,800	0	0			
Do. do. ..	,, 3½	p.c. ..	25,700	0	0			
Premchand Roychand Fund	,, 3½	p.c. ..	3,000	0	0			
Catalogue Fund ..	,, 5	p.c. ..	3,500	0	0			
						42,100	0	0

The Society's property and collections have been insured for three lakhs of rupees.

E. A. PARKER,
Hon. Secretary.

L. W. H. YOUNG,
Hon. Financial Secretary.

The Bombay Branch of

Budget Esti-

INCOME.	Budget 1924.			Actuals 1924.			Budget 1925.		
	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
Entrance Fees	2,000	0	0	2,000	0	0	1,850	0	0
Subn. Resident Members ..	25,000	0	0	25,920	8	0	25,750	0	0
„ N. R. Members ..	4,000	0	0	3,997	8	0	4,000	0	0
Govt. Contribution	4,200	0	0	3,850	0	0	4,550	0	0
Sale of Journal Nos.	} 480	0	0	635	4	3	} 450	0	0
„ of Annual Catalogue ..				57	10	6			
„ of Waste Paper				26	8	0			
Interest	2,500	0	0	2,607	1	3	1,750	0	0
	38,180	0	0	39,094	8	0	38,350	0	0
Subn. Resident Life-Members	..			500	0	0	..		
Catalogue Fund-Sale of Copies, &c.	..			406	12	0	..		
Replacement	..			201	0	0	..		
Sale of Folklore Notes ..	..			10	0	0	..		
Govt. Grant for Shelving ..	..			5,000	0	0	..		
Balance of the previous year ..	5,965	2	1	5,965	2	1	9,547	6	6
Total Rs.	44,145	2	1	51,177	6	1	47,897	6	6

the Royal Asiatic Society

mates for 1925

EXPENDITURE.	Budget 1924.			Actuals 1924.			Budget 1925.		
	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.	Rs.	a.	p.
Books	7,500	0	0	*8,323	8	3	9,000	0	0
Subn. Periodicals, Foreign ..	3,000	0	0	2,634	0	3	2,750	0	0
" " Indian ..	850	0	0	658	13	0	750	0	0
Printing	1,500	0	0	1,887	0	0	1,650	0	0
Journal Printing	2,500	0	0	2,509	8	0	2,300	0	0
Binding and Book-repairs ..	1,750	0	0	1,752	0	0	1,750	0	0
Office Establishment	16,335	0	0	15,743	2	6	16,229	0	0
LibraryFurniture and Shelving	3,000	0	0	..			5,223	14	0
General Charges	1,150	0	0	1,072	4	0	900	0	0
Stationery	900	0	0	580	4	0	800	0	0
Postage	500	0	0	425	15	6	500	0	0
Insurance	523	12	0	523	12	0	473	12	0
Electric Charges	450	0	0	522	3	11	500	0	0
Annual Library Checking ..	..			500	0	0	500	0	0
Provident Fund Contribution	1,353	0	0	1,211	10	8	1,331	0	0
	41,311	12	0	38,344	2	1	44,657	10	0
Temporary Establishment ..	720	0	0	578	5	6	720	0	0
Folklore Notes	750	0	0	750	0	0	..		
Preparation of the MSS. Catalogue	200	0	0	..			200	0	0
Printing MSS. Catalogue ..	750	0	0	..			2,000	0	0
G. P. Notes	..			1,407	8	0	..		
Gratuity	..			250	0	0	250	0	0
Honorarium	..			300	0	0	..		
	43,731	12	0	41,629	15	7	47,827	10	0
Balance	413	6	1	9,547	6	6	69	12	6
Total Rs. ..	44,145	2	1	51,177	6	1	47,897	6	6

* Rs. 500 was subsequently added to the budgeted amount by the recommendation of the Managing Committee.

The Campbell Memorial Fund

A Statement of Accounts ending 31st December 1924.

	Rs.	a.	p.		Rs.	a.	p.
By Balance on 31st December 1923	267	3	1	To Cost of a Cheque book	1	9	0
Interest due on Rs. 3,500 from 15-2-23 to 15-8-24	261	13	0	Transfer fee and stamp, etc.	6	2	0
Interest and principal realised on 4% Terminable Loan for Rs. 500	519	12	0	Cost of 5% loan 1929-47 for Rs. 500	472	1	9
Interest on Rs. 500 re-invested, due on 15-8-24	11	6	0	Cost of a Medal	240	0	0
				Balance on 31-12-24	340	5	4
	1,060	2	1	Rs. ..	1,060	2	1

Invested Funds :—

5 per cent. Government Loan 1929-47....4,000-0-0

FELLOWS

OF THE

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

Royal Asiatic Society

1921 Dr. F. W. Thomas, India Office, London.

1922 Dr. Sylvain Levi, College de France, Paris.

1923 Dr. M. Winternitz, Prague University, Czechoslovakia.

1924 Dr. Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, LL.D., K.C.I.E., Sangam, Poona.

1924 Dr. Henrich Luders, Sybelstrasse 19, Charlottenburg, Germany

1924 Prof. Jadunath Sarkar, Patna University, Patna.

1924 Mahamahopadhyaya Vasudeo Shastri Abhyankar, Fergusson College, Poona.

1924 Shams-ul-ulma Jivanji J. Modi, B.A., Ph.D., C.I.E., Colaba, Bombay.

1924 Vishvanath P. Vaidya, B.A., Bar-at-Law, Cathedral Street, Bombay 2.

1924 P. V. Kane, M.A., LL.M., Angre's Wadi, Bombay 4.

1924 Dr. M. N. Dhalla, 15 R. A. Lines, Karachi.

1924 Sir George A. Grierson, Rathfarnham, Camberley, Surrey.

1924 Prof. N. B. Divatia, B.A., Blue Bungalow, Bandra.

1924 Vishvanath K. Rajvade, Itihas Sanshodhak Mandal, Poona.

1924 Dewan Bahadur L. D. Swamikannu Pillai, Madras.

1924 The Rev. Dr. D. Mackichan, M.A., D.D., 18 Douglas Crescent, Edinburgh.

1924 The Rev. Dr. R. Scott, M.A., D.D., 7 Polwarth Grove, Edinburgh.

1924 Prof. Shaik Abdul Kadir Surfraz, M.A., Elphinstone College, Bombay 1.

1924 Prof. S. H. Hodivala, Bahauddin College, Junagad.

LIST OF MEMBERS

OF THE

BOMBAY BRANCH

OF THE

Royal Asiatic Society

---

† Resident Life Members.
* Non-Resident Members.
*† Non-Resident Life Members.

*1917 Abbott, J., I.C.S. (Bombay).
*1921 Abbott, The Rev. J. E., 120 Hobart Avenue, Summit, New Jersey, U.S.A.
†1925 Abdul Rehman Mahammad Yusuf, Navha House, Queen's Road, Bombay 2.
1922 Abu N. Fatehally, 19 Bank Street, Bombay 1.
1921 Acharya, G. V., B.A., Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay 1.
1919 Acland, The Rev. R. D., Christ Church, Byculla, Bombay.
1923 Adams, R. A., 170 Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
†1923 Adenwalla, Miss Sehra K., 33 Pedder Road, Bombay 6.
1893 Aga Khan, H. H., G.C.S.I., Bombay 7.
†1914 Agaskar, Anandrao B., Warden Road, Bombay 6.
1922 Ainscough, R., Chamber of Commerce, Bombay 1.
1924 Aiyar, K. S., Bombay House, Bruce Street, Bombay 1.
1900 Allum, E. F., Empire of India Life Assurance Co., Singer Building, Bombay 1.
1921 Allum, H. G., Empire of India Life Assurance Co., Singer Building, Bombay 1.
1917 Altekar, Madhav D., M.A., Haji Kasam Blocks, French Bridge, Bombay 7.
*1910 Ambalal Sarabhai, Ahmedabad.
1919 Apte, Waman S., Peerbhoy Mansion, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.
*1925 Apte, Wasudeo G., B.A., 330 Sadashiv Peth, Poona City.
1922 Aptekar, Mrs. M. J., 2nd Peerkhan Street, Byculla, Bombay.
1892 Apyakhtiar, Burjorji N., 305 Chowpaty Sea Face, Bombay 7.
*1923 Arnold, The Rev. F. C., Kolhar, Ahmadnagar.
1921 Arte, M. B., M.A., Royal Institute of Science, Bombay 1.

1919 Ashmead, W. K., Standard Oil Co., Ballard Road, Bombay 1.
1900 Aspinwall, J. E., Elphinstone Circle, Bombay 1.
1923 Baker, A. H., W. H. Brady & Co., Churchgate Street, Bombay 1.
1923 Baker, R. H.
1923 Bakhale, Sadashiv R., B.A., LL.B., Palm Cottage near Kennedy Bridge, Bombay 7.
*1902 Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi, Shrimant, Chief of Aundh, Aundh.
*1924 Balkrishna, Dr., M.A., Ph.D., Kolhapur.
†1894 Balkrishna Vinayak Wasudev, B.A., Warden Road, Bombay 6.
1907 Ball, H. P., C/o B.B. & C.I. Ry., Churchgate, Bombay 1.
1919 Banaji, Dr. B. P., Taj Mahal Hotel, Bombay 1.
1924 Banaji, Miss M. J., 23 B.I.T. Estate, Dadysett Road, Bombay 7.
1925 Banaji, Sorab J., Dadysett Road, Bombay 7.
†1917 Bansude, Princess Savitribai Saheb, Tukogunj, Indore.
1923 Bapasola, R. N., Mubarakh Manzil, Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
*1904 Bapat, Risaldar S. K., Narayan Peth, Poona.
1924 Barker, A. W., Longmans Green & Co., 336 Hornby Rd., Bombay 1.
1920 Barni, Z. A., Govt. Oriental Translator's Office, Bombay 1.
*1919 Barron, W. G., Excise Department, Bombay.
*1925 Barve, Dr. Raghunath A., L.R.C.P. & S., Tarapore, Thana Dist.
1923 Bash, Lawson G., Northern Aluminium Co., Exchange Building, Sprott Road, Bombay 1.
*1921 Baskerville, H. D., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1924 Bassett, C. R., Mackenzies Ltd., St. Helens' Court, Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
1914 Becher, R. A., M.I.C.E., M.I.M.E., Connaught Mansions, Colaba, Bombay 1.
†1916 Behr, Mrs. N. E., Sohrab Mansion, Marzban Road, Bombay 1.
1924 Belgamvala, N. H., "Bombay Chronicle," Bombay.
*†1915 Belvalkar, Dr. Shripad Krishna, Bhamburda, Poona.
1924 Benson, Major C. T. Vere, R.A.M.C., 17 Queen's Road, Bombay.
*1910 Benson, J. J. B.
*1922 Bernard, J. L., Phipson & Co., Delhi.
1921 Bevis, Miss K., Queen Mary High School, Bombay 4.
1915 Bhabha, H. J., M.A., 31 Pedder Road, Bombay 6.
1922 Bhadkamkar, Dr. R. H., M.A., M.D., Tribhuvan Terrace, Lamington Road, Bombay 7.
1924 Bhagwandas Vasanji, Pedder Road, Bombay.
1922 Bhagwat, Prof. N. K., M.A., St. Xavier's College, Bombay.
*1865 Bhandarkar, Dr. Sir Ramkrishna G., LL.D., K.C.I.E., Poona.
1918 Bhandarkar, Shivram V., B.A., LL.B., Tata Blocks, Bandra.
1910 Bhandarkar, Vasudeo G., B.A., LL.B., Khotachi Wadi, Bombay 4.
†1912 Bharucha, F. E., M.A., LL.B., Canada Building, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.

*†1910 BHAVE, VINAYAK L., B.Sc., Thana.
*1920 BHAVE, SHIVRAM G., Raje's Wada, Bhadra, Ahmadabad.
1921 BHENDE, VAIKUNTH R., Alice Building, Hornby Road, Bombay.
*1919 BHISE, S. R., Gokhale Education Society, Bordi, Thana District.
1923 BILIMORIA, M. D., Wadia Building, Dalal Street, Bombay 1.
1925 BLAKEY, M. O., Texas Co., 5 Bank Street, Bombay 1.
1916 BLATTER, The Rev. Fr. R., S.J., St. Xavier's College, Bombay.
1922 BODAS, MAHADEO R., B.A., LL.B., Khotachi Wadi, Bombay 4.
*1921 BOGGS, The Rev. A. M., Mahabubnagar, Deccan.
1911 BOMANJI, K. R., C.S., Pedder Road, Bombay 6.
1925 BOWER, G. N., New Customs, Bombay.
1922 BOYASIS, E., Colour Drug & Co., Taj Building, 210 Hornby Road, Bombay.
*1919 BRAND, C. W.
1919 BRANDER, J. P., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1923 BRANDON, H. E., Breul & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
*1914 BRISTOW, C. H., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1925 BROKENSHAW, A., Central Telegraph Office, Bombay.
*1921 BROOMFIELD, R. S., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1912 BROWN, B., James Finlay & Co., Esplanade Road, Bombay.
*1917 BROWN, C., I.C.S., Central Provinces.
1925 BROWN, G., British India General Insurance Co., 43 Churchgate Street, Bombay 1.
1922 BUCKLEY, L. D.
1922 BULLOCK, R. W., Forbes, Forbes, Campbell & Co., Home Street Bombay 1.
1925 BURT, C. B., 25 Wodehouse Road, Bombay 1.
1923 BUSSELL, F. L.
*1915 BUTLER, H. E., D. S. P. (Bombay).
1912 BUTTERS, R., Deokaran Nansy, Elphinstone Circle, Bombay 1.
1922 CADELL, P. R., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1919 CAIRNS, Dr. J., G. I. P. Ry., Bombay.
†1919 CAMA, DADABHAI F., 4 Pedder Road, Bombay 6.
†1883 CAMA, JEHANGIR K. R., Victoria Road, Civil Lines, Nagpur.
†1880 CAMA, RUSTAM K. R., Ripon Club, Fort, Bombay 1.
†1909 CAMA, T. R. N., Cama Hall, Poona.
1922 CAMERON, R. H.
*1911 CAPTAIN, Mrs. G. M. S., Panchgani, Satara District.
1906 CAPTAIN, M. S., C/o Captain & Vaidya, Solicitors, 12 Esplanade Road, Bombay.
*1921 CARMAN, B. G., C/o E. D. Sassoon & Co., Rangoon.
1925 CARMICHAEL, C. A., Andrew Yule & Co., Nicol Road, Bombay 1.
1918 CARPENTER, H. S., Kodak Ltd., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1921 CARRON, F. G., Port Trust, Bombay 1.

1924 CARRUTHERS, R., Wakefield House, Dougal Road, Bombay 1.
1922 CATLING, A. D. S., Reuters Ltd., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1923 CHAGLA, MAHAMMAD ALI CARIM, Bar-at-Law, 23 Meadows Street, Bombay 1.
1924 CHANDA AMIRUDDIN MUCHHALA, 103 Mody Street, Bombay 1.
1923 CHARD, S. D., Langley & Co., Oriental Building, Esplanade Road, Bombay.
1924 CH. MAHAMMAD ISMAIL, M.A., Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay 1,
*1894 CHAUBAL, Sir MAHADEO B., K.C.I.E., Finance Office Road, Poona.
*1924 CHAUDHARI, ABDUL GHANI, B.A., Comrade, Delhi.
1923 CHOKSEY, R. D., B.A., C/o Dr. Kapadia, Setna Building, Queen's Road, Bombay.
1922 CHOONILAL GIRDHARLAL, 4 Green Street, Bombay 1.
1920 CLARKE, A. D. M., C/o P. Chrystal & Co., Fort, Bombay.
1923 CLAYTON, F., M.L.C., Fleming Shaw & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay.
*1921 CLAYTON, Dr. R. V., B.B. & C.I. Ry., Ajmer.
1924 CLEESE, R. F., Union Insurance Co. of Canton, Central Bank Building, Bombay.
*†1892 COELHO, S., M.A.
*1925 COGHLAN, J. A., D. S. P. (Bombay).
1916 COLLINGS, C. J., Bank of Baroda, Bombay 1.
*1921 COLVILE, Major K. N., Club of Western India, Poona.
*1905 COMMISSARIAT, Prof. M. S., Gujarat College, Ahmadabad.
1922 COOPER, A. L., J. Duxbury & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay.
1916 COVERNTON, Principal A. L., Elphinstone College, Bombay.
*1922 COVERNTON, S. H., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1909 COYAJI, H. C., High Court, Bombay.
1923 CRESSWELL, F. W., Walter N. Cresswell & Co., Elphinstone Circle, Bombay 1.
1919 CRESSWELL, W. N., Elphinstone Circle, Bombay 1.
*1920 CRONIN, J. P., Wm. Gossage & Sons, Karachi.
*1918 CROWDER, M. H., Karachi.
1922 CRUMP, The Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. C., I.C.S., High Court, Bombay.
1919 CUMBERLEGE, Capt. G. F. T., Oxford University Press, Bombay 1.
1921 CURRY, J. E. PRINGLE, Government Shipping Office, Bombay 10.
†1921 DABHOLKAR, LAXMIKANT S., Anandakanan, Chowpaty, Bombay 7.
1924 DABHOLKAR, MANGESH A., V. A. Dabholkar & Co., Princess Street, Bombay 2.
†1904 DABHOLKAR, SHANTARAM N., Anandakanan, Chowpaty, Bombay 7.
1914 DABHOLKAR, Sir VASANTRAO A., Kt., B.E. Chowpaty, Bombay 7.
1921 DADACHANJI, Dr. K. K., Corner Grant Road, Bombay.
1924 DADACHANJI, R. K., B.A., LL.B., Old Small Causes Court Building, Bombay 2.
1914 DALAL, A. R., I.C.S. (Bombay).

1924 DALAL, M. B., Marine Villa, Colaba, Bombay.
†1913 DALAL, RUSTAMJI D., Sardar's Palace, Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
*1915 DALDY, Capt. E. F., C/o P. & O. Co., Aden.
1921 DALVI, D. G., M.A., LL.B., Charni Road, Bombay 4.
1921 DAMANIA, MANECKLAL G., Chowpaty, Bombay 7.
*1922 DAMLE, Prof. N. G., Fergusson College, Poona.
1917 DANCHELL, E. H., Shaw Wallace & Co., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
1923 DANNER, E., Dirst & Co., 70 Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
1924 DAPHTARY, BALKISAN, 13-19 Meadows Street, Bombay 1.
1923 DAPHTARY, CHANDRAKISAN, M.A., Bar-at-Law, 109 Meadows Street, Bombay 1.
1924 DARUVALLA, J. C., Daruvala Building, New Charni Road, Bombay.
1925 DARUVALLA, Dr. P. N., LL.D., Bar-at-Law, 2 B.C., New Queen's Road, Bombay.
*†1920 DASTUR, Dr. N. H., Udwada, Surat District.
1904 DAVAR, Dr. M. B., M.A., Ph.D., 89 Lamington Road, Bombay 7.
1920 DAVID, ISAAC, 4 Queen's Road, Bombay.
1923 DAVIDSON, W. B.
*1919 DAVIS, G., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1910 DEHDASHTI, AGA MAHAMAD H., Kahwakhana, Fort, Bombay.
1891 DEMONTE, Mgr. Dr. B., D.D., J.P., Cathedral Street, Bombay 2.
1887 DEMONTE, Dr. A., M.D., Bandra.
1922 DENNISON, C. H., C/o B. S. N. Co., 120 Frere Road, Bombay.
1922 DESAI, BHULABHAI, J., Advocate, Warden Road, Bombay 6.
1922 DESAI, Dr. RUSTOMJI C., Gangaram Terrace, Tardeo, Bombay 7.
1916 DESAI, Dr. WAMAN G., Hill Road, Bandra.
*1920 DESHMUKH, D. V., B.A., LL.B., Sub-Judge, Bhiwandi, Thana District.
*1911 DEVDHAR, G. K., M.A., Servants of India Society, Poona.
1924 DHURANDHAR, J. R., Ridge View, Vachhagandhi Road, Gamdevi, Bombay 7.
*1925 DIKSHIT, K. N., M.A., Archæological Survey, Poona,
1921 DIVATIA, H. V., Maharaja Mansion, Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.
1922 DIVATIA, Prof. N. B., B.A., Elphinstone College, Bombay.
1924 DODGSON, J. H., Dunlop Rubber Co., Apollo Bunder, Bombay.
1925 DONALDSON, R., C/o B. B. & C. I. Ry. Workshop, Parel, Bombay.
1924 DONNELLY, C. D., Volkart Bros., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
1920 DONOVAN, E., Cox & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
*1925 DORAN, H. F., C/o B. B. & C. I. Ry., Baroda.
*†1919 DORDI, Dr. J. B., Navsari.
*1923 DOUGLAS, H., Imperial Bank of India, Ajmer.
1925 DOVE, W. G., South British Insurance Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1921 DOW, H., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1916 DUCKETT, R.

1925 Duggan, E. M., C/o P.W.D., Bombay.
1924 Dunlop, J., Imperial Bank of India, Akola, C.P.
1920 Dunn, A., the Municipality, Bombay.
1920 Dunne, W. J., Callender's Cable and Construction Co., Killick Building, Bombay 1.
1918 Dunsmore, J. N., Imperial Bank of India, Bombay 1.
1924 Eastwood, C., Braithwaite & Co., Lloyd Building, Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
1925 Edwards, C. A. H., Government Inspector of Railways, Nicol Road, Bombay 1.
1924 Edwards, H. B., Reuters Ltd., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1918 Emslie, A. B., Minimax Ltd., Feltham House, Graham Road, Bombay 1.
1923 Erani, K. H., Near Currey Road Station, Bombay.
1920 Erb, E., C/o E. Spiner & Co., Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.
1925 Erichsen, E., Asian Building, Nicol Road, Bombay 1.
1924 Everatt, E. L., Port Trust, Bombay 1.
*1920 Eves, Graves, Barsi Light Railway, Kurduvadi, S.M.C.
1917 Ezekiel, Prof. E. M., B.A., LL.B., Israel Street, Khadak, Bombay.
1901 Fawcett, The Hon. Mr. Justice C. G. H., I.C.S., High Court, Bombay.
1904 Fazulbhoy Currimbhoy Ibrahim, Sir, Kt., Sakina Mansion, Carmichael Road, Bombay 6.
*1922 Felt, Dr. E. W., Sirur, Poona District.
1924 Ferard, R. L., David Sassoon & Co., Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
1924 Fernandes, B. A., 66 Carter Road, Bandra, Thana District.
1924 Fillunger, Dr. H., Sandhurst House, Merewether Road, Bombay 1.
1917 Fisher, F. J., Reuters Ltd., Bombay 1.
1914 Fleming, R., Prier de Saone & Co., Menkwa Building, Outram Road, Bombay 1.
1924 Flood, F. L., Shaw Wallace & Co., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
1925 Forbes, D. N., M.A., LL.B., Motilal Mansion, Hammum Street, Bombay 1.
1921 Forde, Dr. W. G., Khatau Mansion, Cooperage Road, Bombay 1.
1925 Fox, F. S., Miller's Timber & Trading Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1922 Frenchman, D. P.
1918 Frohlich, H., C/o E. Spiner & Co., Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.
*1923 Frost, J. A., Imperial Bank of India, Karachi.
1922 Fuchsman, S., Sudama House, Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
1913 Furdoonji Dorabji Pudamji, Dadysett House, 25 Waudby Road, Bombay.
*1925 Gadgil, D. R., M.T.B., Arts College, Surat.
1916 Gajjar, M. J., M.A., F.C.S., M.S.C.I., Khetwadi Main Road, Bombay 4.

*1905 GAMBHIR, Prof. J. S., Samaldas College Bhavnagar
1918 GANNON, H., Gannon Dunkerley & Co., Chartered Bank Building, Bombay 1.
1920 GARDINER, G., Cox & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1924 GARLAND, The Rev. G. H. LESTER, Cathedral, Bombay 1.
*1912 GARRETT, J. H., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1923 GEDDIS, A., James Finlay & Co., Chartered Bank Building, Bombay.
1921 GENNINGS, J. F., Secretariat, Bombay.
1912 GHARPURE, J. R., B.A., LL.B., Angre's Wadi, Bombay 4.
*1922 GHORPADE, M. H., Somwar Peth, Poona City.
†1910 GHORPADE, Shrimant MALOJIRAO NANASAHEB, Chief of Mudhol.
†1891 GHORPADE, Shrimant NARAYANRAO GOVINDRAO, Ichalkaranji.
1919 GILDER, Dr. M. D. D., Gazdar Mansion, Princess Street, Bombay.
*1921 GILLIGAN, W. B., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1922 GILROY, Major P. K., I.M.S., Sir J. J. Hospital, Bombay.
1921 GIRDHARDAS LILADHAR, Greaves Cotton & Co., Fort, Bombay.
*1918 GODBOLE, Prof. V. N., 879 Sadashiv Peth, Poona City.
*1925 GODE, P. K., M.A., Bhandarkar O. R. Institute, Poona.
*1923 GOKHALE, A. G., M.A., B.Sc., Excise Analyst, Nasik.
1921 GOODALL, C. H., Bombay Co., Fort, Bombay 1.
1924 GOODIER, The Most Rev. Fr. A., Archbishop of Bombay.
*1910 GORDON, R. G., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1907 GORRIE, H. T., South British Insurance Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1923 GRAHAM, H. J., C/o G.I.P. Ry., Bombay.
1921 GRANT, Capt. W. L., Mackinnon Mackenzie & Co., Bombay 1.
1924 GRAY, P. F., Shaw Wallace & Co., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
1913 GRAY, The Rev. R. M.
1913 GREEN, A. M., I.C.S., Customs Department, Bombay.
1924 GREEN, F. J., Port Trust, Bombay.
1920 GREEN, H. R., Dye Works, Dadar, Bombay.
1923 GREGSON, THOMAS, 11 Khatav Mansion, Bombay 1.
1910 GULABCHAND DEVCHAND, 16 Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
*1924 GUNE, J. G., Kunjavana, Lonavla.
*1922 GUNJIKAR, K. G., B.A., LL.B., Bandra.
1925 GUNJIKAR, K. R., M.A., B.Sc., Elphinstone College, Bombay 1.
1922 GUPTE, G. M., B.A., LL.B., 56 Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
1925 GUPTE, G. S., B.A., L.C.E., City Survey & Land Records, Bombay 1
*1916 GUPTE, Rao Bahadur V. A., B.A., Panchavati, Nasik.
*1920 GURBAXANI, Prof. H. M., Strachen Road, Karachi.
*1923 GUT, GEORGE, Volkart Bros., Karachi.
*1908 GUTIKAR, V. R., B.A., LL.B., Sub-Judge, Hubli.
1925 HAIGH, J. G., Mackinnon Mackenzie & Co., Bombay 1.
*1906 HAIGH, P. B., M.A., I.C.S. (Bombay).

1918 Haji, S. N., Bar-at-Law, Scindia Steam Nav. Co., Sudama House, Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
1924 Halsall, L. A., Anglo-Siam Corporation, Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.
*1910 Hamid, A. Ali, I.C.S. (Bombay).
1920 Hampson, A., C/o J. Duxbury & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
*1916 Hampton, Prof. H. V., Karnatak College, Dharwar.
1917 Hanhart, S., C/o E. Spiner & Co., Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.
1918 Hargreaves, E., Wilson Latham & Co., Central Bank Building, Bombay 1.
*1924 Harnhalli, A. S., B.A., High School, Dharwar.
1919 Harvey, G. E., National Bank of India, Bombay 1.
1922 Hasan F. Ali, N. Futehally & Co., 19 Bank Street, Bombay 1.
1918 Hauser, E., C/o E. Spiner & Co., Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.
1921 Hayward, G. A., Geo. Service & Co., Sorab House, 235-241 Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1914 Hayward, The Hon. Sir Maurice, Kt., I.C.S. (Bombay).
*1924 Hazen, The Rev. W., Rahuri, Nagar District.
1925 Heer, H., Louis Dreyfus & Co., Nicol Road, Bombay 1.
1925 Henderson, L. B., Oxford University Press, Bombay 1.
1925 Heras, The Rev. Fr. H., St. Xavier's College, Bombay.
*1917 Herbertson, J., James Finlay & Co., Karachi.
1919 Herbert, L. W. A., 11-13 Elphinstone Circle, Bombay 1.
*1917 Hewlett, C. H., Graham's Trading Co., Karachi.
1920 Hillel, E., C/o Meyer Nissim, 137 Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
1921 Hingeley, E. F., Dunlop Rubber Co., Apollo Bunder, Bombay 1.
1921 Hodgson, A. J., Callender's Cable & Construction Co., Killick Building, Bombay 1.
*1918 Hodivala, Prof. S. H., Bahaudin College, Junagad.
1924 Hooper, C. T., Exchange Building, Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
1913 Hormasji Ardeshir, L.C.E., 321 Hornby Road, Bombay.
1907 Hotson, J. E. B., O.B.E., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1923 Houston, J., Lloyd's Register of Shipping, Exchange Building, Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
1925 Hughes, R. R., International Bank, Bombay 1.
*†1908 Hume, The Rev. Dr. R. E., M.A., Union Theological Seminary, New York, U. S. A.
1917 Humpherys, S. E., Thomas Cook & Son, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1907 Hunt, N., Greaves Cotton & Co., Bombay 1.
*1921 Husen, Ata, B.A., Government Educational Inspector, Aden.
1922 Hynd, R. R., Hongkong Bank, Bombay 1.
1922 Hyslop, J., Chartered Bank, Bombay 1.
1919 Irani, D. J., C/o Mulla & Mulla, Gresham Building, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
1924 Irani, J. K., Near Fire Brigade, Chinchpokly, Bombay.

1918 Isler, K., Volkart Bros., B
1914 Jackson, Dr. T.S., C/o B.B. & C.I. Railway, Bombay.
1924 Jaffar Hajibhoy, Bar-at-Law, Akbar Building, Hornby Road Bombay 1.
1924 Jagadisan, K., 11 Tata's Old Chawl, Bandra.
1916 Jamnadas Dwarkadas, B.A., 11-19 Churchgate Street, Bombay 1.
1899 Jamshetji Jeejeebhoy, Sir, Bart., Bombay 10.
*1917 Jathar, Prof. G. B., Karnatak College, Dharwar.
†1916 Jayakar, M. R., Bar-at-Law, Girgaum Road, Bombay 2.
*1913 Jayakar, M. S., M.A., Surat.
*1918 Jenkins, J. B., D. S. P. (Bombay).
1911 Jhaveri, K. M., M.A., LL.B., Small Causes Court, Bombay 2.
1924 Jhote, R. B., B.A., Ramchandra Mansion, Bombay 4.
1916 Jones, H. E., Oriental Insurance Co., Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
1922 Jones, H. P., C/o B.B. & C.I. Railway, Bombay 1.
1925 Jones, J. A., C/o B.B. & C.I. Railway, Bombay 1.
1921 Jones, W. E., Drenan & Co., Forbes Building, Bombay 1.
1924 Jones, W. T., Lewis & Jones, 17 Elphinstone Circle, Bombay 1.
1920 Joshi, D. V., 7 Sadanand Building, Bombay 4.
1921 Joshi, Rao Bahadur P. B., Benam Hall Lane, Bombay 4.
1902 Judah, S., B.A., LL.B., Examiner Press Building, Meadows Street Bombay 1.
1924 Judd, A. F., Hongkong Bank, Bombay 1.
1922 Kabad, M. S., B.A., Secretariat, Bombay 1.
*1923 Kale, K. R., Steamer Point, Aden.
1925 Kamat, B. S., B.A., Bombay Cycle Co.'s Building, Mathew Road, Bombay 4.
*1914 Kamat, Major D. D., I.M.S., Ratnagiri.
†1915 Kane, P. V., M.A., LL.M., Angre's Wadi, Bombay 4.
1919 Kanga, Miss Jerbai D. B., Rebsch Street, Jacob Circle, Bombay.
1922 Kanga, P.J., M.A., Tata Iron & Steel Co., Bombay House, Bombay 1.
1925 Kania, Mrs. Bhanumati Hiralal, B.A., 5 Khetvadi Lane, Bombay 4.
1919 Kanji Dwarkadas, M.A., Yusuf Building, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
1920 Kantharia, T. B., Matunga.
1917 Kapadia, H. P., Cathedral Street, Bombay 2.
1922 Karandikar, V. R., B.A.
1924 Kathoke, Miss B. M., Kathoke Lodge, Dadar, Bombay.
1924 Katrak, M. N., 1 Altamont Road, Bombay 6.
*1911 Kelkar, N. C., B.A., LL.B., Poona.
1921 Keller, A., Volkart Bros., Bombay 1.
*1903 Kennedy, B. C. H. Calcraft, I.C.S. (Bombay).
1924 Kennedy, T. S., Fowler Building, Goa Street, Bombay 1.

1921 KERKAR, W. R., B.A., LL.B., Benam Hall Lane, Bombay 4.
*1922 KESARCODI, S. N., C/o Chief Conservator of Forests, Poona.
†1916 KESHAVRAO B. WASUDEW, B.A., LL.B., Bandra.
*1918 KETKAR, Dr. S. V., Ph.D., 841 Sadashiv Peth, Poona City.
1923 KHAMBATA, F. H., B.A., Pol. Department, Secretariat, Bombay 1.
1922 KHABE, L. G., B.A. (Oxon.), Bharucha Building, Princess Street Bombay 2.
1889 KHAREGHAT, M. P., I.C.S. (Rtd.), Mt. Pleasant Road, Bombay 6.
1923 KHER, B. G., 53 Meadows Street, Bombay 1.
*1918 KIDD, H. B., D. S. P. (Bombay).
1910 KIDD, R., National Bank of India, London.
†1904 KIKABHAI PREMCHAND, Share Bazar, Bombay 1.
1915 KINCAID, The Hon. Mr. C. A., I.C.S. (Bombay).
*1904 KINDERSLEY, A. F., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1922 KINGDON, G. P., Shaw Wallace & Co., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
†1924 KISHORDAS P. MANGALDAS, Malbar Point, Bombay 6.
1922 KJELLBERG, Mrs. C. F.
*1912 KNIGHT, H. F., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1924 KOLASKAR, M. B., Bar-at-Law, Girgaum Road, Bombay 4.
*1923 KOLHATKAR, Prof. G. B., Fergusson College, Poona.
*1925 KOTHARI, Rao Bahadur Dr. P. T., Junagad.
1906 KOYAJI, K. N., High Court, Bombay.
*1916 KRISHNAMACHARIAR, Dewan Bahadur G., Hyderabad Dn.
1915 KUBALAYA RAJ, 30 Walkeshwar Road, Bombay 6.
1925 KURULKAR, Dr. G. M., G. S. Medical College, Parel, Bombay.
1922 KURWA, S. E., Bar-at-Law, Walkeshwar Road, Bombay 6.
1925 KYLE, J. C., Chartered Bank, Bombay 1.
1923 LAFAR, Dr. A., Consul for Czechoslovakia, 28 Rampart Row, Bombay 1.
*1915 LAGU, Prof. R. K., New Poona College, Poona.
1923 LALJI NARANJI, Ewart House, Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.
1918 LALKAKA, B. S., Land's End, Bandra.
1922 LAM, B. D., B.A., LL.B., 113 Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
1909 LATIF, HASAN, Bank of India, Bombay 1.
1903 LAWRENCE, The Hon. Mr. H. S., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1921 LAXMIDAS M. SHRIKANT, Kanji Bhavan, 79A Sandhurst Road, Bombay 4.
1915 LAXMINARAYAN, Rao Sahib D., Kampti, C.P.
1923 LEE, H. O., Times of India, Bombay.
1917 LENGACHER, W., Khan & Khan, Fort, Bombay.
1917 LILLEY, E. G., Port Trust, Bombay.
*1924 LIMAYE, Prof. P. M., Willingdon College, Sangli.
1924 LINN, D. C., Alcock Ashdown & Co., Frere Road, Bombay.
1917 LITTLE, T. G. S., Crawford Bayley & Co., Tamarind Lane, Bombay.

1924 LLOYD, Col. R. H., A.D.M.S., 46 Colaba, Bombay.
1920 LONGBOTTOM, J.
1917 LOYD, The Rev. P., Ahmednagar.
1920 LUCAS, C., C/o B. E. S. & Tramways Co., Bombay 1.
1923 LUPTON, F. E., Greaves Cotton & Co., Bombay.
1924 LVOVSKY, Z., Czechoslovak Consulate, 28 Rampart Row, Bombay 1.
*1914 MACDONALD, D., D. S. P. (Bombay).
1921 MCGEE, D., Bombay Telephone Co., Bombay 1.
1906 MACIVER, K., Anglo-Siam Corporation, Tamarind Lane, Bombay.
1914 MCKENZIE, The Rev. J., Wilson College, Bombay 7.
*1907 MACKIE, A. W. W., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1922 MCLEOD, E. R., Prier de Saone & Co., Menkwa Building, Outram Road, Bombay.
1911 MACLEOD, The Hon. Justice Sir NORMAN, High Court, Bombay.
*1908 MACMILLAN, A. M., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1921 MACNABB, R. M., Brough & Co., 56 Bastion Road, Bombay 1.
1920 MACNAGHTEN, Sir HENRY, Kt., Bombay Co., Bombay 1.
*1919 MADAN, J. A., I.C.S. (Bombay).
†1906 MADGAVKAR, The Hon. Mr. Justice G. D., I.C.S., High Court, Bombay.
1924 MADGAVKAR, Capt. V. D., I.M.S., Santa Cruz, Thana District.
1921 MADHAVJI DHARAMSI MORARJI, M.A. (Oxon.), Chinabag, Bombay 4.
1901 MADHAVJI DAMODAR THACKERSEY, 16 Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
1921 MADON, K. J. B., Pareira Hill, Andheri.
1918 MADON, M. P., Bharucha House, Gilder Lane, Tardeo, Bombay 7.
†1923 MADON, P. M., Shivlal Motilal Mansion, Dalal Street, Bombay 1.
1921 MALAVIYA, RADHAKANT, M.A., LL.B., Esmail Building, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1924 MALONEY, T., Mill-Owners' Association, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
*1908 MANN, Dr. H. H., Poona.
1923 MANNING, C. L., Eastern Bank, Bombay 1.
*†1902 MARJORIBANKS, Lt.-Col. J. L., I.M.S., Aden.
1922 MARTEN, The Hon. Justice Sir A. B., Kt., LL.D., High Court, Bombay.
1924 MASON, The Rev. C. D. T., Waudby Road, Bombay 1.
*1906 MASTER, A., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1924 MATANI, G. M., 53 Mint Road, Bombay 1.
1921 MATHALONE, W., Ed. Sassoon Mills, Fergusson Road, Bombay.
1921 MATHEW, Mrs. A. E., St. George Hospital, Bombay 1.
1917 MAVJI GOVINDJI SETH, Allahabad Bank Building, Bombay 1.
1925 MAYENKAR, V. P., B.A., S.T.C., Wilson High School, Bombay 4.
1923 MEARS, R. P., C/o J. C. Gammon, Ltd., Goa Street, Bombay 1.
1922 MEHENDALE, B. K., Bar-at-Law, French Bridge, Bombay 7.
1921 MEHTA, A. C., Income Tax Office, Bombay 1.

1908 MEHTA, Sir CHUNILAL V., Kt., M.A., LL.B., Bombay.
1923 MEHTA, D. R., Laburnum Road, Bombay 7.
1920 MEHTA, FRAMROZ M., 79 Meadows Street, Bombay 1.
1921 MEHTA, INDRAVADAN N., Bar-at-Law, Purshotam Building, New Queen's Road, Bombay.
1918 MEHTA, J. K., M.A., Indian Merchants' Chamber, Hornby Road. Bombay 1.
1900 MEHTA, The Hon. Mr. LALLUBHAI SAMALDAS, C.I.E., 65 Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
1921 MEHTA, M. L., B.A., LL.B., Hammam Street, Bombay 1.
1920 MEHTA, R. A., Kalyan Moti Building, Kandevadi, Bombay 4.
1922 MELDRUM, A. R.
1919 MENDONCA, B., Shivlal Motilal Building, Tardeo, Bombay 7.
1898 MINOCHER, K. M., Bombay Samachar, 8 Frere Road, Bombay 1.
*1915 MINOCHER-HOMJI, Prof. N. D., Deccan College, Poona.
*1915 MODAK, G. B., Gavligudha, Hyderabad (Deccan.)
1920 MODI, Dr. JAMSHET JIVANJI, L.M. & S., L.D., Navsari Chambers, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1888 MODI, SHAMS-UL-ULMA JIVANJI JAMSHETJI, B.A., Ph.D., C.I.E., 209 Hornby Road, Bombay.
1917 MODY, H. P., M.A., LL.B., Cumbala Hill, Bombay 6.
*1908 MONTEATH, G., I.C.S. (Bombay).
*1921 MONTEATH, J., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1908 MONTGOMERIE, A., C.I.E., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1891 MOOS, Dr. N. A., D.Sc., L.C.E., Kalyandas Building, Gowalia Tank Road, Bombay 7.
1922 MORGAN, W. L., Telephone Co., Bombay 1.
1914 MORRIS, C. F., James Finlay & Co., Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
†1911 MOTILAL VALLABHAJI, 37–39, Ghoga Street, Bombay 1.
*1923 MOULAVI, Prof. ABULSAMAD M. H., Karnatak College, Dharwar.
*1923 MUDKAVI, B. S., Belgaum.
†1911 MUHAMMAD YUSUF, Sir, Kt., Amir of Navha, Daryanagar, N. Konkan.
*1918 MUJUMDAR, Sardar G. N., Kasba Peth, Poona.
1922 MULGAVKAR, A. G., Popatwadi, Bombay 2.
1925 MULGAVKAR, B. D., Gopal Narayan & Co., Kalbadevi, Bombay 2.
1924 MULGAVKAR, K. V., B.A., LL.B., Ridge View, Vacchagandhi Road, Bombay 7.
*1917 MULLA, FREDUN D., Bar-at-Law, Residency Road, Hyderabad Dn.
1921 MUNSHI, K. M., Advocate, High Court, Bombay.
1923 MUNSHI, R. F., Bar-at-Law, 40 Pickett Road, Bombay 2.
*1919 MUNSIFF, Dr. JAMSHYD D., Nasik Road.
1922 MUNSTER, J., Port Office, Bombay.

1888 MURARJI GOCULDAS DEWJI, Palm Cottage, Near Kennedy Bridge, Bombay 7.
1921 MUTCH, Capt. C. H.
*1924 MUZUMDAR, Rao Sahib M. S., Currency Office, Karachi.
1918 MUZUMDAR, V. D., M.A., Income Tax Office, Bombay 1.
1922 NACHANE, V. R., Home Department, Secretariat, Bombay 1.
1910 NADKARNI, V. J., Mohan Building, Bombay 4.
*1921 NAGARKATTI, D. N., M.A., B.Sc., Jammu, Kashmir.
*1910 NAGARKATTI, R. S., Dharwar.
*1919 NAHARSINGHJI ISHVARSINGHJI, Sardar, Thakore of Amod, Surat.
1921 NAIDU, Mrs. SAROJINI, Taj Mahal Hotel, Bombay.
*1918 NAIK, S. S., Khar Road, Bandra.
*†1916 NAIK, V. H., M.A., Bar-at-Law, Bijapur.
1924 NAIK, V. N., M.A., Benham Hall Lane, Bombay 4.
†1917 NANABHAI TALAKCHAND, Nihalchand Building. New Queen's Road, Bombay.
*1924 NANAVATI, D. D., I.C.S. (Bombay), Bar-at-Law.
1913 NANAVATI, H. D., B.A., LL.B., 80 Esplanade Road, Bombay.
1917 NARIMAN, G. K., 3 Victoria Cross Lane, Mazagaon, Bombay 10.
1924 NARIMAN, K. F., B.A., LL.B., Wadia House, Hughes Road, Bombay.
1923 NARIMAN, S. B., 113 Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
1901 NAROTTAM MORARJI GOCULDAS, Pedder Road, Bombay 6.
1914 NATARAJAN, K., Editor, Indian Social Reformer, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1921 NAZAR, O. H., Union Bank Building, Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
1914 NERURKAR, Dr. J. S., L.M. & S., D.P.H., Municipality, Bombay 1.
1922 NIEDERER, GEORGE, Sulzer Bruderer & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1920 NIMBALKAR, Shrimant MALOJIRAO MADHOJIRAO NAIK, Phalton.
1923 NIX-JAMES, Miss E., C/o B. E. Society's School, Byculla, Bombay.
1921 NIXON, Miss L. E.
1924 NOPPER, C., West End Watch Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
*1918 NORMAN, D. R., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1902 NORMAND, Dr. A. R., M.A., Wilson College, Bombay 7.
1916 NUNAN, Dr. W., M.D., Grant Medical College, Bombay.
*1912 O'BRIEN, Lt.-Col. E., Kolhapur.
*1922 OGILVIE, R. D., Imperial Bank of India, Ajmer.
1922 OGILVY, J. A., Allahabad Bank, Bombay 1.
1922 O'RORKE, G. M., Development Department, Bombay 1
1923 PADGAOKAR, G. V., 32 B Post Office Lane, Bombay 4.
1915 PAGE, F. J., C/o B.B. & C.I. Railway, Parel, Bombay.
1923 PAGE, HAROLD.
*1923 PALEKAR, Rao Bahadur B. A., Ratnagiri.

1924 PALMER, A. J., Union Insurance Society of Canton, Central Bank Building, Bombay 1.
1908 PALMER, The Rt. Rev. Dr. E. J., Bishop of Bombay.
*1916 PANDIT, A. G., Jamalpur Road, Ahmedabad.
1922 PAPA, R. E., B.A., LL.B., 48 Meadow Street, Bombay 1.
*1895 PARASNIS, Rao Bahadur D. B., Satara.
*1923 PAREKH, Dr. M. K., Godhra, Panch Mahals District.
1918 PARKER, Dr. E. A., M.A., Ph.D., Wilson College Bombay 7.
1925 PARPIA, YUSUF R., Zainab Manzil, Turner Road, Bandra.
1921 PARKS, W. BATTERSBY, Ford, Rhodes & Parks, Examiner Press Building, Meadows Street, Bombay 1.
1912 PARUCK, Miss S. S., M.A., Habib Mansion, New Queen's Road, Bombay 4.
1912 PATKAR, S. S., B.A., LL.B., Hughes Road, Bombay 7.
1924 PATTENSON, Mrs. DOROTHY M. TYLDEN, G.I.P. Railway, Bombay.
†1912 PATWARDHAN, Shrimant CHINTAMANRAO DHUNDIRAJ *alias* APPASAHEB, Sangli.
1922 PATWARDHAN, N. M., Bar-at-Law, Sarasvati Villa, Laburnum Road, Bombay 7.
*1917 PATWARDHAN, R. P., M.A., Deccan College, Poona.
1910 PAVRI, N. P., M.A., LL.B., Silloo Villa, Circus Avenue, Jacob Circle, Bombay.
1923 PAYMASTER, Capt. S. A., I.M.S., Thos. Cook & Son, Bombay.
1915 PEARSON, E. G., Times of India, Bombay.
1916 PENNINGTON, Lt.-Col. R. W. R., Lloyd's Bank, Bombay.
1922 PERSHA, SHANKAR S., Examiner Press Building, Meadows Street Bombay.
1922 PETIGARA, D. K., Bar-at-Law, 7 Bell Lane, Bombay.
1923 PETIGARA, Khan Bahadur K. J., Dy. Comr. of Police, Bombay.
†1922 PETIT, DINSHAW J., Mount Petit, Bombay 6.
†1897 PETIT, JEHANGIR B., 359 Hornby Road, Bombay.
1920 PHATAK, N. R., B.A., Laxminarayan Press, Bombay 2.
1922 PIKE, G. O., Shaw Wallace & Co., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
*1916 POPE, J. A., I.C.S., Imperial Customs, Bombay.
1923 PORTER, Major F. J. W., D.S.O., R.A.M.C., C/o Lloyds Bank, Bombay.
1916 PORTLOCK, F., James Mackintosh & Co., Elphinstone Circle, Bombay 1.
*1923 POTDAR, Prof. D. V., B.A., New Poona College, Poona.
1902 POWVALA, K. S., 251 Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1898 POWVALA, R. S., 251 Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
*1909 PRADHAN, R. G., B.A., LL.B., Nasik.
1921 PRADHAN, W. B., B.A., LL.B., Charni Road, Bombay 4.
1923 PRATAP, V. K., 84-92 Kandevadi, Bombay.

*1920 PRATT, F. G., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1909 PRICE, C. STANLEY, London Lancashire Insurance Co., Churchgate Street, Bombay 1.
1922 PURSHOTTAM ISHWARDAS, Garden View, Hughes Road, Bombay.
1923 PURSHOTTAM TRICUMDAS, Bar-at-Law, 5 Hirji Mansion, Darasha Road, Bombay 6.
1900 PURSHOTTAM V. MOWJEE, Malabar Hill P.O., Bombay 6.
*1925 RABADE, R. V., 131 Shanwar Peth, Poona City.
1917 RAFIUDDIN AHMAD, Moulavi, 13 Phayre Road, Poona.
1925 RAGHAVAN, N. V., Accountant General, Bombay 1.
1924 RAISMAN, ABRAHAM, I.C.S. (Bombay).
1918 RAMASUBAIYAR, K. N., B.A., B.L., Municipal Office, Calcutta.
1915 RAMDAS HARIDAS, 320 Mint Road, Bombay 1.
1920 RAMPTON, L. W.
1916 RANADAY, Capt. S. G., I.M.S. (Retired), Thakurdwar, Bombay 2.
*1920 RANADE, V. G., C/o E. S. High School, Alibag.
1919 RANGASWAMY, C. S., 113 Taj Mahal Hotel, Bombay.
1922 RANGNEKAR, S. S., B.A., LL.B., Bar-at-Law, Chief Presidency Magistrate, Bombay.
1911 RAO, Dewan Bahadur G. S., B.A., LL.B., Bombay 2.
1925 RATANBAI, V. T. MULJI, Lady, Jivan Lodge, Andheri.
†1921 RATANSI DHARAMSI MORARJI, Mt. Pleasant Road, Bombay 6.
1922 RAWLINS, J.
*1910 RAWLINSON, Prof. H. G., M.A., I.E.S., Deccan College, Poona.
1924 REID, The Rev. A. R. R., The Grange, Wodehouse Road, Bombay.
1914 REITH, A. M., George Service & Co., Sorab House, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
*1925 REMINGTON, G. L., B.B. & C.I. Railway, Rutlam.
1910 REUBEN, Miss R., 9 Mazgaon Terrace, Bombay 10.
1922 RICKWOOD, H. A., Fire Insurance Association, Allahabad Bank Building, Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
1921 RINGGER, CHARLES, Volkart Bros., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
*1924 ROBERTS, Miss EDNA, Panchgani.
*1924 ROBERTS, Lt.-Col. Sir JAMES R.
1921 ROBINSON, A. E., 17 Marine Lines, Bombay.
1918 ROBINSON, A. S.
1919 RODDA, V. V., Oriental Translator's Office, Bombay 1.
1924 ROLFE, J. A. S., Port Trust, Bombay 1.
*1922 ROSE, The Rev. R. S., Sholapur.
1907 ROW, Dr. RAGHAVENDRA, B.Sc., M.D. (Lond.), Marine Lines, Bombay.
1924 ROWE, G. C., Land Acquisition Officer, Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
1921 ROWLANDS, R. D., Croft and Forbes, Standard Building, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.

1919 ROWLANDSON, B. C., Port Trust, Bombay 1.
*1909 RUSHTON, K. C., Police Department (Bombay).
*1902 SABNIS, Sir RAGHUNATHRAO V., Kt. Kolhapur.
1925 SAHASRABUDHE, Dr. N. S., M.B.B.S., Wadekar Building, Girgaum Road, Bombay 4.
*1924 SAHIBZADA SURFRAZ ALI KHAN, Jaora, C.I.
1921 SAKLATWALA, J. E., Bombay House, Bruce Street, Bombay 1.
1920 SALDAHNA, F., Marshall & Sons, Ballard Road, Bombay 1.
1924 SANDERS, J. H., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1919 SANDERSON, P. M. D., Phipson & Co., Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
*1921 SAWTELL, The Rev. W. A., Sholapur Road, Poona.
1921 SANDILANDS, Dr. J. E., Municipality, Bombay 1.
*1925 SARAIYA, MANILAL S., Navsari.
*†1905 SATHE, ACHYUT S., M.A., B.L., Wardha, C.P.
1919 SATHE, VAIDYA APPA SHASTRI, Kankadvadi, Bombay 4.
1923 SCARPA, Dr. G., Italian Consulate, Bombay 1.
1924 SCHILLING, Mrs. R., Taj Mahal Hotel, Bombay 1.
1918 SCHMID, H. W., Volkart Bros., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
*1915 SEN, K. C., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1917 SETALWAD, MOTILAL C., 64 Napean Sea Road, Bombay 6.
1904 SETNA, N. P., Fergusson Road, Parel, Bombay.
1921 SHAH, B. C., Kalbadevi Road, Bombay 2.
1921 SHAH, C. R., Govardhan Mansion, Bhatvadi, Bombay 4.
†1917 SHAH, HIRALAL A., B.A., Morarji Goculdas Market, Bombay 2.
1913 SHAH, The Hon. Justice Sir LALLUBHAI A., Kt., M.A., LL.B., Pedder Road, Bombay 6.
1917 SHAMJI HEMRAJ, Readymoney House, Churchgate Street, Bombay 1
1908 SHANKS, A. D., Vacuum Oil Co., Nicol Road, Bombay 1.
1924 SHARMA, Pandit SHRIKRISHNA M., KARTANTIK, Bharucha Building, Princess Street, Bombay 2.
1925 SHARPE, B. C., Gateside, Mazgaon, Bombay 10.
*1915 SHASTRI, Prof. M. G., Deccan College, Poona.
1922 SHEJWALKAR, T. S., Jagannath Chawl, Fanasvadi, Bombay 2.
1904 SHEPHERD, W. C., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1919 SHERWOOD, C. C., McKenzie's Ltd., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
1925 SHILOTRI, Dr. PRABHAKAR S., M.A., Ph.D., Shilotri Bank, Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.
1918 SHOORJI VALLABHDAS, Navsari Building, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
*†1915 SHROFF, D. D., Amraoti, C.P.
1922 SHUTTLEWORTH, G. D., Croft and Forbes, Standard Building, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1923 SMITH, A. FORBES, C/o H.S. Smith & Co., Pathe Building, Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
1923 SMITH, R., Anglo-Siam Corporation, Tamarind Lane, Bombay 1.

*1919 Soares, Prof. A. X., Baroda College, Baroda.
1923 Solomon, Principal W. E. Gladstone, School of Art, Bombay 1.
1923 Solomon, R., Kalbadevi Road, Bombay 2.
*1921 Sorley, H. T., I.C.S. (Bombay).
*1914 Sothers, D. B., I.F.S. (Bombay).
1922 Sowani, D. G., B.Sc., B.E., Tukaram Javji Building, Bombay 7.
1922 Sowerby, Mrs. R.
1903 Spence, R. A., Phipson & Co., Apollo Steet, Bombay 1.
1925 Spyromilio, M., Ralli Bros., Bombay 1.
1924 Stella, Eugene, Princess Street, Bombay 2.
1922 Stevens, J. A.
*1924 Stevenson, The Rev. J. S., M.A., B.D., Parantij, Ahmadabad.
1922 Stewart, P. M., D. S. P. (Bombay).
1922 Stonebridge, A. W., Santa Cruz.
1925 Stott, J., Gillanders Arbuthnot & Co., Churchgate Street, Bombay 1.
1917 Subedar, M., Sudama House, Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
†1919 Sukthankar, Bhalchandra S., M.A., LL.B., Shantaram House, Walkeshwar Road, Bombay 6.
1915 Sukthankar, Dr. Vishnu S., M.A., Ph.D., Shantaram House, Walkeshwar Road, Bombay 6.
1915 Suleman Haji Ibrahim, Napean Sea Road, Bombay 6.
1923 Sunder, S., 28 Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
1906 Surfraz, Prof. Shaik Abdul Kadir, M.A., Elphinstone College, Bombay 1.
1920 Suter, M., Maurice Suter & Co., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
1922 Symonds, S. L., Forbes, Forbes, Campbell & Co., Bombay 1.
1919 Tairsee, L. R., Borabazar, Holichakla, Bombay 1.
1924 Talayarkhan, Daraus R., Woodlands, Pedder Road, Bombay 6.
1922 Talayarkhan, K. M.J., Bar-at-Law, 56 Esplanade Road, Bombay 1.
1922 Taraporevala, V. F., Bar-at-Law, High Court, Bombay 1.
1896 Tata, Sir Dorabji J., Kt., Bombay House, Bruce Street, Bombay 1.
*1915 Taylor, E. G., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1900 Taylor, R., Longmans Green & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1920 Taylor, W. S., Reuters Ltd., Bombay 1.
†1911 Telang, P. K., M.A., LL.B., Adyar, Madras.
1924 Terry, Capt. E. W. G., R.A.S., C.M.T., Connaught Mansion, Colaba, Bombay.
1919 Thacker, Miss H. M., Cama Hospital, Bombay.
*†1914 Thakore, B. K., Narayan Peth, Poona City.
1924 Thakore, Govindlal N., Ekadashi Building, Parekh Street, Bombay 4.
†1906 Thakore, Ishwarlal N.
1922 Thomas, W. H., Development Department, Bombay 1.
1924 Thompson, Miss M. W., Y. W. C. A., Mayo Road, Bombay 1.

1919 TILLEY, J. S., Mackenzie's Ltd., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
*1921 TILLU, G. D., M.A., Panvel.
1923 TODD, A., Phipson & Co., Apollo Street, Bombay 1.
1922 TOMLINSON, Miss J., Cathedral Girls' School, Bombay 1.
†1915 TRIPATHI, D. T., China Baug, Bombay 4.
1915 TUCKER, L. F., Eastern Bank, Bombay 1.
*1915 TUCKER, R. H., Leonel Edwards Ltd., Karachi.
1924 TURNER, A. J., Technological Laboratory, Matunga, Bombay.
†1921 TYABJI, AMIN M. B., Chowpaty Sea Face, Bombay 7.
1924 TYABJI, CAMAR S., Central Bank Building, Bombay 1.
1916 TYABJI, FAIZ B., Bar-at-Law, Warden Road, Bombay 6.
1923 TYABJI, HUSAIN B., M.A., LL.M., Small Causes Court, Bombay 2.
1904 TYABJI, SHAMS A., Central Bank Building, Bombay 1.
*1908 TYABJI, SALMON B., A.M.I.C.E., P. W. D. (Bombay).
1911 UNDERWOOD, Dr. E. F., 381 Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
*1905 VAIDYA, C. V., M.A., LL.B., Kalyan.
†1921 VAIDYA, J. S., Zandu Pharmacy, Bombay 13.
†1905 VAIDYA, V. P., B.A., Bar-at-Law, J.P., 18 Cathedral Street, Bombay 2.
1921 VAKIL, K. H., B.A., LL.B., Vila Vasant, Santa Cruz.
*1911 VAKIL, N. B., 3 Napier Road, Poona.
1922 VARERKAR, B. V., Khetvadi, Bombay 4.
1923 VASVANI, B. J., M.A., Modern Publishing Co., Abba Building, Carnac Road, Bombay 2.
*1918 VAZE, S. G., Servants of India Society, Poona.
*1906 VENKOBA RAO, B., B.A., Archæological Department, Mysore.
1920 VENN, T. W., C/o B. S. N. Co., 120 Frere Road, Bombay.
1912 VICAJEE FRAMJI VICAJEE, Bar-at-Law, Watson Annexe, Apollo Bunder, Bombay.
1925 VIJAYAKUMAR, B. PANNALAL, Nizam Building, Kalbadevi, Bombay
1924 VIJAYARAI KALYANRAI, Jhaveri's Chawl, Ville Parle, Andheri.
*1920 VINCHURKAR, Shrimant NARAYANRAO GOVINDRAO, Nasik.
*1920 VISVESHWARAYYA, Sir M., K.C.I.E., Bangalore.
*1910 VORA, C. H., Kalabhavan, Baroda.
1892 WADIA, C. N., Bella Vista, Cumbala Hill, Bombay 6.
1922 WADIA, N. J., I.C.S. (Bombay).
*1923 WADIA, K. N., M.A., B.Sc., Broach.
1899 WADIA, Prof. P. A., Wilson College, Bombay 7.
1914 WAGLE, B. K., B.A. (Cantab.), Kandevadi, Bombay 4.
1924 WALDRON, O. W., Robert Ingram Clarke & Co., Oriental Building, Bombay 1.
1916 WALKER, D., Times of India, Bombay 1.
*1922 WALKER, J., Hyderabad, Sind.
1922 WALLACE, R. P., 16 New Queen's Road, Bombay 4.

*1913 WALVEKAR, G. K., B.A., LL.B., Hubli.
1922 WATTS, A. F., Port Trust Railway, Bombay 1.
1923 WEBB, A. C., Lloyd Triestino S. N. Co., Ballard Estate, Bombay 1.
1925 WEBB, W. H., Alcock Ashdown & Co., 24 Argyle Road, Bombay.
1917 WEBSTER, J. H., Eastern Bank, Bombay.
1925 WEIR, G. E. M., Croft & Forbes, Standard Building, Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
*1922 WELINGKAR, R. N., B.A., Karnatak College, Dharwar.
1922 WELMAN, P. H., Prier de Saone & Co., Menkwa Building, Outram Road, Bombay.
*1917 WILLIS, Lt.-Col. G. H., R.E., Finance Department, Government of India, Delhi.
1915 WILSON, Mrs. D., Killick Nixon & Co., Hornby Road, Bombay 1.
1925 WILSON, H. E. Sir LESLIE, P.C., G.C.I.E., C.M.G., D.S.O., Governor of Bombay.
*1924 WODEHOUSE, Prof. E. A., Deccan College, Poona.
1925 WOOD, EVELYN, Ralli Bros., 21 Ravelin Street, Bombay.
1921 WOODS, D. F., G.I.P. Railway, Bombay.
1925 WRIGHT, The Rev. ARTHUR Y., Wesleyan Chaplain, Apollo Bunder, Bombay.
1925 WRIGHT, FRANK, C/o B.E.S. & T. Co., Bombay 1.
1923 WRIGHT, F. T., C/o B.B. & C.I. Railway, Bombay.
*1920 WRIGHT, The Rev. H. K., Ahmednagar.
1915 YOUNG, L. W. H., B. S. N. Co., 120 Frere Road, Bombay.
1921 ZIMAN, S. N., I.C.S. (Bombay).
1915 ZIMMERMANN, The Rev. R., S.J., St. Xavier's College, Bombay.

TRANSLITERATION OF THE SANSKRIT AND ALLIED ALPHABETS

अ	a	औ	au	ठ	ṭh	भ	bh
आ	ā	क	k	ड	ḍ	म	m
इ	i	ख	kh	ढ	ḍh	य	y
ई	ī	ग	g	ण	ṇ	र	r
उ	u	घ	gh	त	t	ल	l
ऊ	ū	ङ	ṅ	थ	th	व	v
ऋ	ṛ	च	c	द	d	श	ś
ॠ	ṝ	छ	ch	ध	dh	ष	ṣ
ऌ	ḷ	ज	j	न	n	स	s
ए	e	झ	jh	प	p	ह	h
ऐ	ai	ञ	ñ	फ	ph	ळ	ḻ
ओ	o	ट	ṭ	ब	b		

ं (*Anusvāra*)	ṁ	× (*Jihvāmūlīya*)	ẖ
ँ (*Anunāsika*)	m̐	≍ (*Upadhmānīya*)	ḫ
: (*Visarga*)	ḥ	ऽ (*Avagraha*)	'